

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, not by us; and the treaty has been ratified by the other nations. I voted for every amendment which I thought was proper before the other parties had ratified the treaty, but now that they have ratified it, and it is in existence and in operation so far as they are concerned, I regard it as unwise, if not impossible, for us to amend the treaty which they have already accepted without amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think I can rely upon the Senator from Connecticut to do anything he can legitimately to kill the treaty, and, if putting an amendment on it would hinder its ratification and tend to kill it, I thought he would favor it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator is quite justified in thinking that I would do anything I could legitimately to kill the treaty, but I would want to do it in a wise way, and I would not want folly added to my crime.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was using the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Missouri and their attitude toward the treaty to emphasize my opinion that this amendment would hinder and not help ratification. I thank Senators for their attention, and I again urge that without pride of opinion or effort to adhere to past action we seek reservations protecting the interests of our country which may still receive the requisite votes for ratification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to the reservation proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. KING. Mr. President, at the proper time I shall offer the amendment which I send to the desk as a substitute for the reservation offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. I merely tender it now, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD, and at the appropriate time I shall offer it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. KING to the reservation proposed by Mr. LODGE is as follows:

Amend reservation No. 4 so that it will read as follows:
"4. The United States understands that the jurisdiction and authority of the council or the assembly of the league do not include any power over the proper domestic, internal, or national police of any member of the league, and that said articles do not confer upon the league any powers with respect to immigration, imposts, property, inheritance, naturalization, citizenship, labor, coastwise traffic, or any other matter of proper domestic policy. This enumeration of matters of policy shall not in any wise be taken to exclude from authority of the United States any other subject of domestic policy properly within the national political powers and sovereignty of the United States, as recognized by the law and custom of nations. The United States will not submit to arbitration or to consideration of the council any question which in its judgment is a question within its domestic jurisdiction and sovereignty."

NOTICE OF CONFIRMATIONS.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Florida, who desires to make a request.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding, and I shall occupy merely a moment. On the 20th of February a number of post-office nominations were confirmed by the Senate, including several from my State. Under the rule requiring two executive sessions before they can be certified to the President they have not as yet been certified. Therefore, as in executive session, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the post-office nominations which were confirmed on the 20th of February be now certified to the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am reminded that the nomination of marshal for the northern district of Georgia was confirmed a few days ago. I do not think any unanimous consent order was made that the President should at once be notified. The former marshal is going out of office on the 1st of the month, and it has been arranged to change the office on that date; so it is quite important that the President should be notified.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all confirmations made on February 20.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 28, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 27, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast made us and filled our souls with longings, hopes, and aspirations, cleanse us from all guile and imbue us with light to guide us, strength to sustain us, in every laudable ambition.

The world is facing a crisis and our Nation is facing with it great trials. Save us, we beseech Thee, from perils of stupidity and blunders and guide us safely on to the genius inspired by our fathers that we may live and grow in everything that is pure, and noble, and holy. In the Christ spirit. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SURPLUS MOTOR EQUIPMENT HELD BY WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up Senate bill 3037 and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3037, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3037) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer, free of charge, certain surplus motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment to the Department of Agriculture, Post Office Department, Navy Department, and the Treasury Department for the use of the Public Health Service, and certain other surplus property to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks to insist on the amendments of the House and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a House bill amended by the Senate?

Mr. KAHN. No. It is a Senate bill amended by the House.

Mr. GARNER. And the Senate disagrees to the House amendments and asks for a conference?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the request is to insist upon the House amendments?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. I should have said so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as the conferees on the part of the House, Mr. KAHN, Mr. MCKENZIE, and Mr. DENT.

THE AMERICAN LEGION.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD an editorial which appeared simultaneously in five eminent independent journals of Ohio on the proposition of the American Legion. It is a very illuminating editorial, nonpartisan, and short.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial relative to the American Legion. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I regret very much to object to anything that the gentleman from Ohio might suggest should go into the RECORD, but if we begin now to insert into the RECORD editorials suggesting the policies which Congress should pursue with reference to the legion there will be no end to it. Only yesterday we referred all these measures to a committee of the House for the purpose of consideration. Would it not be better to wait until that committee reports out a bill and gives consideration to it before we encumber the RECORD with editorials? I am not going to object to-day, but I would like for somebody who is responsible for the RECORD to take care of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. This is a copy of the editorial printed simultaneously in five most important papers in Ohio, namely, the Toledo News-Bee, the Cleveland Press, the Cincinnati Post, the Akron Press, and the Columbus Citizen:

JUSTICE FOR THE SOLDIER AND SAILOR.

The American Legion, through its executive committee, asks that Uncle Sam pay to all ex-service men and women a \$50 bond for each month of service during the war.

Commander Franklin D'Oller, in presenting the legion's case, says the Government has granted additional pay to its clerks for war service. War-time workmen in shipyards and munitions plants were paid high wages.

What the soldiers and sailors want, therefore, is not in its strict sense a bonus. They want a compensation adjusted to other Government rates of pay. And they have it coming to them.

The United States committed a regrettable blunder by not paying our soldiers at least \$3 a day, as this newspaper advocated at the time. The result is that the service men came home to find the cost of living inflated, the buying power of the dollar deflated, and himself without war savings to help him build for the future.

Of all suggestions so far advanced for a fair and retroactive compensation to our active war forces, the proposed legion bonds plan is the best, the most just, the most workable.

It dovetails in with the present necessity for Government economy, for the bonds would involve no immediate expenditure of money.

They would be issued directly from the Government to the ex-service men and women, with no intermediate floating of a bond issue or increased taxation to pay for them.

The bonds would mature at a future date, in line with the just contention that the future generations should help pay for the Great War, which was conducted as much in their interests as the present's.

Canada and Australia, the two countries most like ours, have already set the example, though both their resources and man power were drained more than ours by the war.

Australia sent 400,000 of its 5,000,000 population overseas. It paid its fighting forces 40 per cent higher than our men were paid. Yet Australia did not consider its duty completed when it had merely brought its fighters home. The Australian blinched in the war is given a \$3,500 home by his Government at a rent of 2 cents a month. Returned men were given from \$10.50 to \$15.50 a week until they found jobs. Able-bodied ex-service men who desire to farm are loaned \$2,500 as working capital at low interest.

Canada, from a population of 8,000,000, sent 400,000 overseas. It paid its soldiers better than America.

Returned Canadians were given bonuses ranging, according to length of service, from \$400 to \$600 for married men and \$280 to \$420 for single men. Returned Canadians got \$75 a month until they found jobs.

Canada has free vocational and farming training for its ex-fighters. Those who want to farm are loaned by the Government up to \$4,500 for land, \$2,000 for live stock, and \$1,000 for buildings and equipment.

Interest is at 5 per cent, and the borrower has 25 years in which to pay. The Soldiers Land Settlement Board of Canada has spent about \$200,000,000.

In contrast with Canada and Australia, the United States has done practically nothing for its ex-service veterans. The Lane project, to give them reclaimed land, fell through. A \$60 bonus was voted, but it was a drop in the bucket.

Many suggested forms of bonuses have been advanced. We know now what the soldiers themselves, through the American Legion, want. They ask nothing but fairness. The legion bonds can be granted without financial difficulty. They should be granted.

PRODUCTION OF CORN.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for about three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the gentleman is going to speak about.

Mr. RUBEY. I want to boost Missouri a little.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter from the editor of the Farm Journal, a paper published at Philadelphia, calling my attention to the fact that some time ago they offered a prize of \$1,000 for the best 5 acres of corn produced in the United States. This letter states that this prize was awarded to Missouri, and that the prize went to Mr. J. R. Shelton, of Holden, Johnson County, Mo., for the best 5 acres of corn in the United States, the average yield being 127½ bushels per acre.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Do you know how many States that same thing has been issued to? [Laughter.]

Mr. RUBEY. I will say to the gentleman that Indiana, I am informed, got the second prize. [Laughter.] No; I beg the gentleman's pardon; Indiana received the third prize. Ohio was the second.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The same first prize that you are now talking about went to Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUBEY. I hope the gentleman will not interfere with my little boost for my State. [Laughter.] Especially I hope he will not do that in view of the fact that this \$1,000 prize goes to a farmer in my State who competed for it in the usual way, along with many hundreds of farmers from all parts of the country. Nearly 1,500 farmers competed for this prize in Ohio, Indiana, and Missouri, and notwithstanding the large number of competitors in these States Missouri carried off the prize. And I want to say in addition to this that the statement is made by the gentleman who won this prize that he won it without fertilizer, using simply the good old-fashioned Missouri soil. That produced 127½ bushels per acre on the average for the 5 acres.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Did the gentleman notice the other day a statement made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, showing how much larger the production of corn per acre was in Oklahoma than in Missouri?

Mr. RUBEY. I did not notice that. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this, if I do not exceed my time, and that is that there has been a larger yield per acre than the one I have cited, but that was when fertilizer was used and I acre was taken as the example.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say, so far as Oklahoma is concerned, that it must have been barred from the competition in this matter; otherwise Missouri would not have won in the competition with the State of Oklahoma. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri, who is manifesting so much State pride, that so far as that yield of corn is concerned, Alabama has the record of 237½ bushels. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUBEY. That was in a boys' contest some years ago, when only 1 acre was cultivated and fertilizer was used.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am glad the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] has called attention to the great yield in Missouri, and that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has referred to the yield of 237½ bushels in his State. I want to say if they continue to encourage these farmers in Missouri and in Alabama they may possibly get up to the record, eventually, of North Carolina, which holds a record of 250 bushels per acre, the largest in the history of the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope no more of the gentlemen will interrupt me, because if they do there is no telling how large this yield is going to get to be. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri will admit that the State of Texas is in a class by itself, and is not involved in this controversy.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in connection with what has been said, it was reported to me the other day that a former Member of this House, Joseph C. Sibley, had raised on 12 acres of ground 331 bushels of corn to the acre. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RUBEY. They are still going up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It shows the effect of being a Member of Congress.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from Illinois is joking again. Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; that is an actual fact.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Speaker, while we are on this subject, I had a similar letter from the same paper. I desire to make reference to the subject of prizes for wheat. The average annual yield of wheat per acre in the United States for a 10-year period was stated as 15.8 bushels. In the State of Washington the average annual yield is 25.4 bushels to the acre for the same period. In the prize contest the first three prizes on wheat went to the State of Washington, one man raising approximately 84 bushels to the acre, another approximately 82 bushels to the acre, and a third approximately 82 bushels to the acre. All three of the prizes went to Island County, the wheat being produced on one of the largest islands in the United States, located in Puget Sound and in the congressional district which I represent. [Applause.]

To be exact, the prize winners, their residence and production, are as follows:

Fred De Wilde, Oak Harbor, Wash., 83.96 bushels per acre.

John Le Sourd, Coupeville, Wash., 81.33 bushels per acre.

Justus L. Hancock, Coupeville, Wash., 81.24 bushels per acre.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to close my statement by again calling attention to the fact that the remarkably high yield in Missouri was obtained under field conditions. From what has been said by my colleagues, it looks like the mistake I made was in reporting my yield first. [Laughter.]

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, to show that there were three prizes offered last year for the largest yield of an acre of potatoes in the United States, and that Aroostook County, in my district, obtained all three prizes. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of a better yield of legislation, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. Wood of Indiana, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, H. R. 12610, with Mr. Longworth in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will resume the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of the Interior, \$12,000; First Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; Assistant Secretary, \$4,500; chief clerk, including \$500 as superintendent of buildings, who shall be chief executive officer of the department and who may be designated by the Secretary to sign official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries, \$4,000; assistant to the Secretary, \$2,750; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; assistant attorney, \$2,500; 2 special inspectors (whose employment shall be limited to the inspection of offices and the work in the several offices under the control of the department), at \$2,500 each; 6 inspectors, at \$2,500 each; chief disbursing clerk, \$2,500; chiefs of divisions—1 of supplies, \$2,250; 1 of appointments, mails, and files, \$2,250, and 1 of publications, \$2,250; expert accountant, \$2,000; clerks—4 at \$2,000 each, 12 of class 4, 2 at \$1,740 each; 1 \$1,620, 16 of class 3, 1 \$1,500, 19 of class 2, 1 \$1,320, 24 of class 1, 4 at \$1,000 each; returns office clerk, \$1,600; female clerk, to be designated by the President, to sign land patents, \$1,200; 7 copyists; classified laborer, \$1,140; skilled laborer, \$804; multigraph operator, \$900; assistant multigraph operator, \$720; typewriter repairer, \$900; 2 telephone switchboard operators; chauffeurs—1 \$1,080, 10 at \$720 each; 10 messengers; 7 assistant messengers; 22 laborers; skilled mechanics—1 \$900, 1 \$720; 2 carpenters, at \$900 each; plumber, \$900; electrician, \$1,000; gardener, \$600; messenger boys—1 \$540, 1 \$420; five packers, at \$660 each; 2 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 8 female laborers, at \$400 each; captains of the watch—1 \$1,200, 1 \$840; lieutenants of the watch—1 \$1,020, 5 at \$840 each; 3 sergeants of the watch, at \$750 each; 66 watchmen; engineer, \$1,200; assistant engineer, \$1,000; 7 firemen; clerk to sign, under the direction of the Secretary, in his name and for him his approval of all tribal deeds to allottees and deeds for town lots made and executed according to law for any of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in the Indian Territory, \$1,200; in all, \$318,590.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question.

On page 101, lines 14 and 15, I note that there is 1 chauffeur at \$1,080, and that there are 10 chauffeurs at \$720. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee why it requires \$1,080 for 1 chauffeur when 10 chauffeurs can be secured at \$720 apiece.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will say, in answer to the gentleman from Ohio, that the \$720 men are truck drivers, while the \$1,080 man is the chauffeur for the Secretary of the Interior, to drive his private car. I wish further to state that in the estimates submitted they asked for three chauffeurs for the Secretary's private automobile—one day man, one night man, and a relief man. We thought the Secretary of the Interior might be able to get along with one chauffeur.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. When the gentleman speaks of the Secretary's "private chauffeur" he means his personal chauffeur?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In connection with his official duties?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; that is what I mean.

Mr. SNELL. Does the Secretary himself work on his job night and day?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I presume, of course, that he would not ask for anything but what was official and that would indicate that the Secretary of the Interior was working night and day. As I have stated, the estimate was for three chauffeurs—one day man, one night man, and one relief man.

Mr. BEGG. Does it take greater skill to handle a passenger car than it does to handle a truck? Why the discrepancy of \$360 a year?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is very good reason for that. In the first place the higher-priced chauffeur works longer hours, and in view of the fact that we did not appropriate for a night chauffeur for the Secretary of the Interior, I presume this one chauffeur will have to do some night work. Then aside from that he has to keep himself in better attire and more in accord with the position that he is occupying, and I do not think that the amount given to this chauffeur is unreasonable. It is the same amount that is given to the chauffeurs for the other Cabinet officers.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For per diem in lieu of subsistence of two special inspectors, while traveling on duty, at not exceeding \$4, and for actual necessary expenses of transportation (including temporary employment of stenog-

raphers, typewriters, and other assistance outside of the District of Columbia, and for incidental expenditures necessary to the efficient conduct of examinations), to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, \$4,500.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct the typographical error in the word "typewriters," in line 16.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will make the correction.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Indian Office: Commissioner, \$5,000; assistant commissioner, \$3,500; chief clerk, \$2,750; financial clerk, \$2,250; chiefs of divisions—1 \$2,250, 1 \$2,000; law clerk, \$2,000; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; private secretary, \$1,800; examiner of irrigation accounts, \$1,800; draftsmen—1 \$1,400, 1 \$1,200; clerks—13 of class 4, 25 of class 3, 30 of class 2, 60 of class 1 (including 1 stenographer), 32 at \$1,000 each (including 1 stenographer), 34 at \$900 each, 2 at \$720 each; messenger; 4 assistant messengers; 4 messenger boys, at \$420 each; in all, \$283,790.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire the attention of the gentleman in charge of the bill for a moment. I notice he has dispensed with 26 clerks in the Indian Bureau. I read the hearings, but was unable to find much concerning that matter. I want to find out from the gentleman if he knows just what work these clerks are doing whom he proposes to abolish.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Acting upon the best information that we had, and knowing the desire of Congress to reduce expenditures in the Indian Bureau as rapidly as possible, and believing that the bill recently introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma will have a tendency in that direction, we decided that we could dispense with this number of clerks. I will state to the gentleman that I have had a conference with Mr. Sells, who has charge of the work, and he has agreed that he will make a showing to the Senate committee of just exactly what they want. I apprehend that there will not be much trouble if they make a showing that there is a necessity for these clerks, and that the remedy may be had on the other side.

Mr. CARTER. I want to say to the gentleman that I am in full sympathy with his purpose in reducing expenses of all bureaus. Seeking to carry out that purpose, the Indian Committee reported and the House passed the bill relating to citizenship which should operate to release many competent Indians, but that bill has not yet passed the Senate. I am in hopes it will pass the Senate, because it should materially reduce the expenses of the Indian Bureau. Granting that this bill should become a law during this session, however, it may still be necessary to maintain the present force until all administrative work necessary to releasing competents and distributing their per capita of tribal funds has been accomplished. I was just wondering if the clerks that this would turn loose might not be the very clerks required for this important work.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will say that in the opinion of Mr. Sells we have reduced some clerks that he regards as essential. There was no showing of that fact before the committee, and we felt justified in so doing. Mr. Sells has his recourse, and he can make his showing before the Appropriation Committee at the other end of the Capitol when this bill gets there for consideration. There is no disposition on the part of this committee to cripple the service. When that showing is made before the Senate committee there will be no trouble on this proposition.

Mr. CARTER. What the gentleman expects to do is to have this matter thrashed out before the Appropriation Committee of the Senate, and if it can be shown that the services of these clerks are really needed, they will be retained.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is the idea, that the matter will be taken up before the committee having this bill in charge.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman means the legislative committee, the appropriating committee.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. In other words, the gentleman is willing to agree to the employment of all clerks necessary to the service, and with this announcement I found myself in accord with the purpose of the gentleman.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is not our desire to cripple the service. We are perfectly willing to appropriate for as many clerks as are necessary to carry out and complete this work.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee, I think the matter can be adjusted upon a proper showing before the Senate committee, as he has stated. While I am on my feet I want to say that there was no increase in the service of this branch during the war because of the war, and therefore there is no demand for a decrease like there is in a good many other departments of the Government, as, for instance, in the War Department and the Navy Department, where a great many temporary clerks

were employed. As I understand, in the Indian Service there were no temporary employees during the war.

I want to say further that I am in sympathy with the chairman of the subcommittee and the membership of the House generally in reducing the expenditures wherever it can be done without any injury to the service. But I want to leave this additional thought with the committee. A good many believe that as you individualize the lands and moneys of the Indians that you can immediately decrease the expenses. That is a mistake. When you deal with Indian tribes you deal with them much more cheaply from a governmental standpoint than when you deal with them as individuals. The Indian Office now is engaged in individualizing the lands and moneys of the Indians, and therefore more attention has to be given to the individual Indian than heretofore. As I remarked a moment ago, we used to deal with the Indians in their collective capacity. For instance, we dealt with the Five Civilized Tribes collectively as tribes. Within the last few years we have been dealing with the individual members of the tribes, and therefore it has taken more clerical force; it has taken more employees, both in Washington and in the field, than when you deal with them in their collective capacity. I wanted to invite the gentleman's attention to that, because I was afraid that he had not had occasion to give any detailed study to the Indian question which necessitated an increase rather than a decrease in the clerical force in the bureau and in the field.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am at a loss to know why, after the Government has allotted the land to the Indians and has declared the Indian competent to manage his own affairs, relieving him of the tribal relation, it should be necessary to spend a dollar on him from Washington; why there should be an overhead charge here in Washington with respect to the Indians that have been practically released from Government control.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman understands; he is an old Member of the House—been a member of the Indian Committee for 16 or 18 years—he knows that the supervision over the individual Indian has been retained by the Indian Office in Washington. He knows that the competency commissions go among the various tribes and that they have to report to Washington and their work has to be supervised and approved, and that supervision is kept over nearly all the individual Indians until they are entirely free and able to manage their own affairs.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I also know that in the same connection this supervision is retained more in the interest of the man who holds the job than in the interest of the Indian.

Mr. HASTINGS. That may be true, but we must have the clerical force to take care of it until the method is changed.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The method should be changed now.

Mr. HASTINGS. But it has not been changed. It is up to Congress to enact the legislation the gentleman complains of, and that can not be done on this bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And it never will be changed while you continue to appropriate and grant additional help on the demand of the Indian Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Patent Office: Commissioner, \$5,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get some information from the chairman of the committee. Within the last few days there has been one of the largest delegations of business men I have ever seen at the Capitol before the Committee on Rules in connection with the Nolan bill, which provides for various increases and changes in the Patent Office. These gentlemen claim that on account of the salaries paid in the Patent Office they are unable to keep efficient and experienced examiners, and on account of this inexperience on the part of new men there is growing up throughout the country a lack of confidence in the work of the Patent Office. Furthermore, they say the Patent Office is from 130 days to a year behind in its work. I would like to know whether this condition of affairs was brought to the attention of the committee, and, if it was, what the committee did in connection with it, and if we should give further consideration to this condition in this bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion I think that further consideration should be given to this measure. I do not know exactly what the terms of the measure are, but I do know that there is need for relief in the Patent Office. The

Patent Office has received as little attention, so far as increases of salaries are concerned, as any department of this Government. The business of that office has increased more than 100 per cent in the last six months.

Mr. SNELL. That was one of the statements made before our committee.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is absolutely correct, and the Patent Office is one of the few offices that are revenue raisers for the United States. I think the amount that will come in as net, after paying all of the overhead charges, for the present year will amount to \$250,000. I would say to the gentleman that we gave to the Patent Office very nearly all they asked for in their estimates. We did not undertake to increase any salaries for the reason that we felt if we did we would invite trouble and it would result in getting nowhere because of the fact that every increase would be subject to a point of order, and any attempt at any general increase in this office would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. SNELL. There are no increases carried in this bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No.

Mr. SNELL. These gentlemen made the statement before the Rules Committee that it was absolutely impossible to get the technical men necessary in the Patent Office at the prices being paid now, that outside business corporations had taken all of the best men and paid them anywhere from 30 to 100 per cent more than they were getting in the Patent Office.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That was substantially the evidence before our committee. We did do this: We gave them a great many new places, and we felt that that was as far as we could go; and, in fact, it was all they asked us to do.

Mr. SNELL. From the information that is before the Committee on Appropriations, then, the gentleman would consider this a good proposition for the Rules Committee to consider?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; I think it is worthy of further consideration.

Mr. SNELL. And worthy of consideration by the House?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think so. If the gentleman will take the time to read the hearings on that proposition, submitted by Mr. Newton and some of those who are attached to the office, he will find them very illuminating and that they contain a great amount of valuable information. As I stated here the other day, all of the ingenuity that was set loose during the war, and that was then expending itself on war inventions, is now turning its attention to inventions of peace-time instrumentalities, and this has increased the business of the office more than 100 per cent.

Mr. SNELL. These gentlemen made the statement that they are from 130 days to 1 year behind in their work, and that there is a great deal of business being held up because of the fact that people are not able to get papers from the Patent Office.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is no doubt about that, and that is why we gave them the additional force in this office.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman indicate the surplus accumulated from fees in excess of what has been spent in the conduct of the office? Is it not some seven or eight or ten million dollars?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is no surplus. The money has all been covered into the Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Has the gentleman any idea how much the office earns yearly in excess of the cost of administration?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It varies. Their estimate at the time these hearings were held was that the surplus for the year 1919 would be \$144,424, and they further estimated that if they had additional help, which we have given them, they would be able to do a great deal better than that this year.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman also in regard to furnishing copies of patents, and so forth? I have had a number of complaints from men who state that the Patent Office informs them that they could not furnish printed copies or other copies of patents. Why can they not do that?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They can. Of course, a limited number of patents are printed in the first instance, and they do not always know how many they will need. Sometimes they do not need the regular quota and other times they need many times more, and one of the reasons assigned for additional help is that they do not have sufficient force to do this extra work.

They get a photostatic copy of the patent, and have even gone so far as to permit some man who is engaged in photostatic work and private institutions engaged in this kind of work to make photostatic copies in order to supply the demand they could not supply to produce these original copies.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, recently I got a communication something like this; where the Patent Office had stated they could not furnish a printed copy of the patent, but a printed

copy had been ordered; and also at the same time, although they had ordered the printed copy and had an appropriation for it, they were seeking to convey the impression to the correspondent that the reason they could not furnish the copy in the first instance was that Congress had not given them money enough.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There may be some truth in that. They are asking, for the purpose of relieving the situation the gentleman is speaking about, an appropriation from the deficiency committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Education: Commissioner, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; specialist in higher education, \$3,000; editor, \$2,000; statistician, \$1,800; specialist in charge of land-grant college statistics, \$1,800; 2 translators, at \$1,800 each; collector and compiler of statistics, \$2,400; specialists—1 in foreign educational systems and 1 in educational systems, at \$1,800 each; clerks—5 of class 4, 6 of class 3, 7 of class 2, 9 of class 1, 13 at \$1,000 each; 2 copyists; 2 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; messenger; assistant messenger; messenger boy, \$420; in all, \$82,860.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling attention to what seems to me to be an absurd appropriation. Under the Bureau of Education we are appropriating for a commissioner and that commissioner gets \$5,000 a year. On the next page we have the Superintendent of Capitol Building and Grounds, and we give him \$6,000 a year. We also have a lighthouse superintendent who gets \$6,000 a year. We have a Superintendent of the Bureau of Standards who gets \$6,000 a year, and you might stand here and enumerate officers in the Government, who in my judgment are not as important as the Commissioner of Public Education in the United States, whose salaries range from \$6,000 to \$10,000 a year. Now, I want to say to the chairman of the committee I shall not offer any motion to raise the salary of the Commissioner of Public Education of the United States, but I do think this, he is worth more than \$5,000 a year or he is not worth anything.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will gladly yield for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Pursuing the gentleman's line of thought, we have numerous porters here in the public buildings in Washington drawing a salary of \$1,000 a year and \$240 bonus, making \$1,240 a year, and we have college graduates teaching school here in the city of Washington who do not draw over \$840 a year.

Mr. BEGG. I agree with the gentleman all the way through, and the thought I want to leave with the House is this: If the public education of these United States is worth anything it is worth appropriating enough money to get the best man you can get of that particular profession for its head, and \$5,000 to-day will not hire a school man big enough to command sufficient respect of even the village superintendents throughout the country to get his recommendations considered.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will gladly yield for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the Commissioner of Education have anything to do with the school activities of the different sections?

Mr. BEGG. I will answer that question by saying that if the gentleman will follow the next page he will find there we are appropriating money to the Commissioner of Public Education for the purpose of making investigations in various lines of education. We are giving him money to spend. He makes the investigations, and I simply maintain this position of a \$5,000 man can not make an impression on a \$12,000 superintendent, or a \$9,000 superintendent, or a \$7,000 superintendent. Even in our village schools in this country they are getting more money than the Commissioner of Education. I do not know anything about the Commissioner of Education—the present incumbent. This is not an attack upon him. He is probably a \$20,000 man. It is poor policy for this Government to appropriate a miserly, measly sum like \$5,000 a year when a little city in any State will give a man competent to be superintendent not \$5,000 a year but it will give him \$7,000 or \$8,000. In any commercial line we will give anywhere from \$7,500 to \$10,000 and \$12,000 a year.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I just wish to supplement the list of \$6,000 employees by calling the attention of the gentleman to the fact that we are paying the reporters for committees \$6,000.

Mr. BEGG. Very true; and I could go on, if I should make an investigation, and find any number of them. I want to appeal to the gentlemen of this House, the majority of you who have children to educate. I believe that the most critical thing

in America and the most vital thing would be to pay your educators a salary big enough and great enough that would attract the biggest and best men of that calling in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEGG. May I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will be glad to yield for a brief question.

Mr. BEGG. I just wanted to make this suggestion, that I do not know a large city in my State that is not to-day paying its superintendent of education \$5,000 a year, and if this man is worth anything he ought to be worth more than that or the position ought to be abolished.

Mr. BEGG. I just stated a minute ago that either the Commissioner of Education of the United States is worth more than \$5,000 a year or he is not worth carrying on the pay roll. He is absolutely detrimental if he is not worth more than \$5,000, but because of custom, and custom alone, we sit here and appropriate \$5,000 a year for that job. Now, when I say custom and custom alone, there was a time in this country when \$5,000 commanded a representative educator, but that time has passed. I would like to see this committee in its next bill—and I shall not make any effort at this time—but in its next bill I should like to see the committee do one of two things: Either eliminate the office or else pay a salary big enough to get a representative man from that profession, so that when he makes a recommendation to my city or your city, to my school officials and to your school officials, that recommendation will command respect.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I gladly yield.

Mr. GARD. With the gentleman's positive ideas on this question, does he intend to offer an amendment to increase the compensation or strike out the appropriation?

Mr. BEGG. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio I do not so intend at this time. I think it is probably sufficiently potent to call the attention of the House to it. I know they are all fair men, and I do not care to disrupt the committee's plan of holding this down as low as possible, but if I am in this House when the next bill comes up I shall do so unless the committee does it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take issue with my colleague from Ohio in what he has said, but I want to call his attention to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations respects the law that Congress gives us to act under, and the law in reference to this subject fixes the salary of the Commissioner of Education at \$5,000 a year. The Appropriation Committee must follow that instruction or its action would be subject to a point of order. The committee that has the original jurisdiction of fixing this salary is the place to address remarks of this kind, rather than by implication, leaving the impression that the Appropriation Committee is not doing its full duty toward this office.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WASON. Certainly.

Mr. BEGG. I want to state—and I thought I did clearly state—that I meant no criticism of the committee. I merely meant to centralize the attention of this House on the condition that exists, and if that is the law it does not excuse the House. We amend statutes every day to help out some banking industry or some commercial institution, and the fact that it is by a law that we pay this commissioner \$5,000 a year and we can not get the kind of a man we want for the place does not excuse us from responsibility. I am not centering my remarks to the committee at all, but to the House.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] referred to the Commissioner of Education as superintendent of public instruction in the United States. Those are not the duties of the Commissioner of Education. It is not the duty of the General Government to superintend public instruction in the United States, and even if it were it has not yet been assumed. The Commissioner of Education presides over a bureau the total appropriation for which for all purposes are considerably less than \$175,000 a year. The other gentlemen, whose salaries were mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio, have important duties and have charge of large sums of money. The Bureau of Education has a few experts—I presume they are—and they publish some annual reports which, in the main, are not read even by the school-teachers of the country, because, in the main, they are not valuable. But

the chief work of the Bureau of Education is looking after the health and education of the Eskimo in Alaska. That is about all they do. And while they are making a great and noble effort to teach the Eskimo children in Alaska all there is to be known about reading, and writing, and science, and art, and literature, and then, in addition, teaching them how to live—doubtless a very valuable work—after all we have taken a lot of that away from them in this bill, because it is not done either economically or well. They have just issued a bulletin, a copy of their educational magazine—for the publication of which I do not know where the authority exists, but it is worthless—devoted to education, and so forth, in Alaska, and no one can read it without thinking how silly most of it is. If the Government of the United States wants to undertake the supervision of public instruction in the United States, they ought to pay a man a very high salary to do that. I do not believe the time has come when the education throughout the country should be removed from local control and centralized in a bureau of Government clerks in Washington. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph, in order to get the floor for a few minutes.

I want to indorse what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] said a moment ago, because I believe his position is well taken, but I do not believe he ought to be so timid about the matter that he will make a good suggestion and then not back it up by offering a proper amendment. All of us know that the Commissioner of Education for the United States Government is drawing too little when he draws a salary of only \$5,000 a year, a thousand dollars less than the officers who superintend the public buildings and other places in Washington.

Mr. BEGG. Lighthouses.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. And of lighthouses, who draws \$6,000. If the gentleman hesitates about offering his amendment for fear of getting a curtain lecture from the floor manager, I will agree to inveigle the Republican majority leader out into the cloak room and entertain him a few minutes, and let the gentleman offer his amendment while the floor manager is outside.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BEGG. I want to advise the gentleman from Texas that it is not fear.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it is not; it is not fear, but timidity, if anything, because I heard him get a lecture in here one day, and he did not take it at all. He promptly and properly asserted his rights. But I knew something was keeping him from offering a proper amendment, because he did make a good suggestion. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON] is mistaken when he tells his colleague that the committee does not have authority to raise the salary. The committee has that authority, or has assumed to exercise it in this bill.

Mr. BEGG. I will say to the gentleman, if I may, that it is sometimes the better part of discretion to go when you can get somewhere, rather than to run up against a wall.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. But we can not get anywhere unless we keep pegging away at these older fellows until we get them to act and to get out of these old ruts, and some of us new fellows have got to keep after them all the time in order to get them out of these old ruts, and why I take so much time on the floor is because I am trying to get some of these old fellows to change their old extravagant methods and economize.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if he does not believe that in the interest of orderly procedure in legislative action we should first increase the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Education of the Federal Government and give him some authority before we increase his salary?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, well, if his duties are those of an ordinary janitor we ought to discard the office. But if he is really a United States commissioner of education, in its real sense, we ought to add enough dignity to the position by paying him a proper salary commensurate with such duties. As suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], we ought not to keep an office here and maintain it and designate it by the big name of "Commissioner of Education of the United States" on a measly, miserly salary. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON] said by way of excuse that the committee did not have any authority to raise this salary. The committee assumed the authority in the bill to create and place a lot of new positions in here unauthorized by law, and fix generous salaries opposite the new positions created. The gentleman will remember that I made points of order against each and every one of them, and the Chair sustained my points of order,

and struck out of the bill the various appropriations for these new positions attempted to be created. The Chair held that they were unauthorized by law. That was done yesterday. I made a point of order to four of them, and the Chair sustained it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I think his statement to the effect that they had authority ought not to have been made, because it was evident that they do not have authority, or the point would not have been sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. The committee had authority to fix the pay of the officers authorized by law, and this is one of the officers authorized in the law, and the committee should have assumed the authority to fix a proper salary.

Mr. MADDEN. No. The salary is fixed in the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks permission to withdraw his pro forma amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will object to the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the committee did not make any change of salary here because the salary is fixed by law. Any change in this law would be subject to a point of order and consequently, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] has well remarked, he does not care at this time to offer an amendment and run up against an obstacle that could not be overcome.

I wish, however, to make a suggestion in this connection. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON] stated that the committee was a law-abiding committee, as it doubtless is. But I hardly regard this as a strict matter of law, and I hope that the gentleman from New Hampshire will not regard me as hypercritical when I say that the public is getting misled sometimes by the expressions that we use with reference to amendments that are subject to a point of order because they are not in accordance with the rules of the House.

The Chair the other day, using language that has been used for so long that he had abundant precedent for it, referred to a certain amendment that was offered and other amendments of its class as being illegal. In no strict sense of the word, and, as I think, in no proper sense of the word, are these amendments that are subject to a point of order illegal. They are simply not in accordance with the rules of the House. But if we were doing anything illegal, or proposing to do anything illegal by adopting them, then every time unanimous consent is asked for some action we are being asked to do something that is illegal, because it is not provided for by the rules of the House. Yet we do this nearly every day, and sometimes 50 times a day. If we did not, the rules, instead of facilitating our business, would make it absolutely impossible to ever get through with it. Unfortunately the public is getting misled by that expression, and I have seen several times in the public prints statements to the effect that Congress was doing things that it knew to be illegal, when it was simply by unanimous consent doing something that was not in accordance with the ordinary rules of the House. Congress has the lawful right to do anything that is authorized by the Constitution, and in the exercise of its rights it may at any time dispense with all of its rules. Provisions in a bill that are subject to a point of order are not illegal, for Congress has the right to use the rules or not, as it may choose. On the contrary, they are absolutely lawful if no Member raises the point of order, provided, of course, that no constitutional objection can be properly urged.

I simply mention this in order to correct a misapprehension that is now existing in the mind of the public to a considerable extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

SURVEYORS GENERAL.

After June 30, 1920, the offices of surveyors general in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, and the Territory of Alaska are discontinued, and the several surveyors general shall, on or before that date, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, deliver into the custody of the Commissioner of the General Land Office all field notes, maps, records, and other papers, and all furniture and equipment of their respective offices, and the Commissioner is authorized, whenever the surveys and records of any surveying district are completed, to dispose of such field notes and plats of survey as are duplicates of records in his office in accordance with sections 2218 and 2221 of the Revised Statutes, and from and after June 30, 1920, the authority, powers, and duties in relation to the survey, resurvey, or subdivision of lands and all matters and things connected therewith, heretofore vested in and exercised by the several surveyors general, including the use in his office of deposits by individuals for office work, the like use of funds arising under the acts of March 2, 1895 (28 Stats., p. 937), and June 25, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 834), and the employment of personal services thereunder and for office work on Indian surveys, shall be vested in, and devolve upon, the Commissioner of the General Land Office: *Provided*, That so much of the clerical force in the offices of surveyors general as may be needed and such records as may be necessary may be transferred to the General Land Office in Washington, and the Joint Committee to Assign Space in Public Buildings shall provide the necessary additional space in the Interior Department Building.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. FRENCH. I make the point of order that it is legislation which, under the rule, is not proper to be included in an appropriation bill. I refer especially to the latter part of paragraph 2 of Rule XXI, which provides—
nor shall any provision in any such bill—

That is, an appropriation bill—

or any amendments thereto changing existing law be in order, except—

First:

Such as, being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States.

Second:

By the reduction of the compensation of any persons paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

Third:

By the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

And fourth:

That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House Members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment.

This proposition, I think, no one will contend comes from a committee which has jurisdiction. There is in existing law provision made for the establishment of surveyors general in the different States mentioned in this paragraph and in the Territory of Alaska. The laws have been provided, passed at different times, and this paragraph proposes to wipe them all out, and in lieu of the law to provide the language in the existing bill.

No. 4 of the propositions referred to in the rule provides that an amendment of this character might be in order if it came from a proper committee or from a joint commission authorized by law. This, however, is not such a case. Therefore it seems we need not discuss that particular feature. It also does not come within provision No. 2 that I referred to, as to the reduction of the compensation paid to any person out of the Treasury of the United States, because this does not propose to reduce the compensation of any person.

There are two other provisions, however, in the rule that bear upon this particular section. The two are the ones that I referred to as No. 1 and No. 3. No. 1 is that an amendment shall be in order—

such as, being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States.

Of course that is conditioned upon other parts of the rule.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Would you contend that it did not reduce the number of officers?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no; I do not contend that; but I am going to connect that up with another part of the rules of the House that I think is very pertinent to the case.

Mr. SNELL. If it did not reduce the salary or number of officers, you would not have any objection, because it would not take anything away from you?

Mr. FRENCH. I would have objection to the way it is proposed the work shall be handled.

The third provision to which I referred was that an amendment would be in order, other things being considered as satisfactory, if it reduced the amounts of money covered by the bill. This amendment may or may not reduce the amount of money covered by the bill. It does reduce the amount covered by the bill of last year and of several previous years. It is problematical and hypothetical whether the work, if done in the manner proposed, would in years to come be handled more economically than under the present system. It also appears to reduce the number of officials, because it does wipe out the several surveyors general. But it is also an established rule that an amendment of this kind is not in order if it enlarges the scope of the work of an officer whose office is already established. If you will turn to the section as it is proposed, you will find that the offices of the different surveyors general are wiped out. Then you will find that the duties conferred heretofore upon the surveyors general are conferred upon the Commissioner of the Land Office. Beginning with line 17, on page 113, the language of the bill recites—

And the several surveyors general shall, on or before that date—

The date for the abolition of the offices—

under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, deliver into the custody of the Commissioner of the General Land Office all field notes, maps, records, and other papers, and all furniture and equipment of their respective offices, and the commissioner is authorized, whenever the surveys and records of any surveying district are completed, to dispose of such field notes and plats of survey as are duplicates of records in his office in accordance with sections 2218 and 2221 of the Revised Statutes.

With the exception of the last line, that is, of course, all new legislation. It does not have relation to the abolition of the offices. Now, on page 114, line 2, the language is:

And from and after June 30, 1920, the authority, powers, and duties in relation to the survey, resurvey, or subdivision of lands and all matters and things connected therewith, heretofore vested in and exercised by the several surveyors general, including the use in his office of deposits by individuals for office work, the like use of funds arising under the acts of March 2, 1895 (28 Stats., p. 937), and June 25, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 834), and the employment of personal services thereunder and for office work on Indian surveys, shall be vested in and devolve upon the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

In other words, you add to the duties and responsibilities of an officer certain duties and responsibilities that have not heretofore been added, and which are now under the law vested in several different officers, whose offices it is proposed to abolish.

There have been several decisions upon this particular point. If you will turn to Volume IV of Hinds' Precedents, section 3680, you will find a case cited where the Committee on Agriculture brought in the Agricultural appropriation bill and omitted the appropriation for the salary of the chief clerk of the Bureau of Animal Industry. In lieu of that provision, however, the committee provided that there should be an assistant chief of division. This assistant chief of division was not authorized by law, and a point of order was made against the paragraph on the ground that it was in violation of the provisions of the rule to which I have directed attention. After the matter was considered the Chairman ruled that the point of order was well taken; that the committee did not have the authority in wiping out one office to bring in a provision in the bill creating other offices within the same bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman allow the Chair to call his attention to the fact that the ruling just quoted by him was made in the House when the Holman rule was not in existence?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me call attention to section 3598 of Volume IV of Hinds' Precedents. Here was a ruling made after the adoption of the Holman rule. The Committee on Appropriations brought in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill with a provision that included the language—

For additional expenses involved in keeping the Library (of Congress) open from 9 a. m. to 10 p. m., \$15,000.

The point of order was made against that language under the same rule to which I have directed attention. Here was an instance in which the committee sought to add new duties, new powers, and new responsibilities to the library force, and under the rule the Chairman held that the point of order was well taken and that the committee did not have authority to report such legislation.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That was clearly out of order, because of the fact that it was new legislation that did not pretend to retrench expenditures or to discharge officers. That was the ground upon which it was held out of order.

Mr. FRENCH. It was held out of order because it added new responsibilities and duties to an officer whose responsibilities and duties had been fixed by law.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. And did not retrench expenditures.

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, it did not retrench expenditures. But the rule also is very definitely held in this House that whenever any part of a section falls under the ban of the point of order it carries with it the entire section that is involved. It is true that these several offices could be abolished under the Holman rule, and if the section simply provided for the abolition of the offices of the several surveyors general, no one could contend that that proposition would not be in order under the rules of the House. But here is a proposition that not only abolishes the offices of the several surveyors general but also establishes additional duties and responsibilities which are placed upon the Commissioner of the General Land Office which are not his under existing law, and under the same rule under which it has been held that an amendment reducing expenses by abolishing offices is in order, it has also been held that if a particular part of a provision is out of order the entire section of which it is a part must fall with it.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Upon what theory can it be claimed that this is a reduction of expenses? This provides for the repeal of the law creating the various surveyors general for the several States and turning the jurisdiction over to the Commissioner of the General Land Office. How can anyone at this time say that it is a saving of any expense?

Mr. FRENCH. I prefaced my remarks with the statement that even that question is hypothetical, that it is speculative. We do not know whether it will reduce or increase expenses. If the gentleman will turn to the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office for last year—chart opposite page 103—he will find that for every acre of land surveyed in the United States, in States where there is no surveyor general's office but where the work is handled from Washington, the office expenses per unit of acres surveyed is far greater than the average expense of surveying lands in the States where there are surveyors general's offices.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I knew that the gentleman knew that, and that is the reason I wanted to call it out. As a matter of fact, the expenses will be more, because of the distances and the greater amount of travel of the men who will have to be sent out to do this work, instead of having it done by the surveyor general in the State who is right on the ground with a force that can do the work.

Mr. FRENCH. Under the practice of a hundred years we have handled the matter through officers—surveyors general—right in the States where most of the surveys have been made. When the work of surveying the public land is about to pinch out—and it is pinching out in some States right along—the offices are abolished and the work taken over by the General Land Office. But in the handling of that work—I am not talking about the work in the field, I am talking about the office work alone in the city of Washington—the cost is greater than that of doing the same kind of work in the offices of the different States.

The chairman of the committee may say that the appropriation is less for the coming fiscal year than for the current year. This is doubtless so, but it would not necessarily be so on the basis of work done. It might be smaller, because there will not be so much work done in the next fiscal year as in the present year or the last one.

Let me call the Chair's attention to section 6878, in Hinds' Precedents, where it has been held that when a part of a section that is out of order is not germane, under the rule, the whole paragraph proposed must fall with it. In that case during the consideration of the Army appropriation bill in the committee Mr. HULL of Iowa made a parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not if a part of the paragraph was held subject to a point of order the whole paragraph would be stricken from the bill, and the Chair ruled upon the point and said that if the point of order was made against the entire paragraph, yes; but if the point of order was directed against a part of the paragraph, then only the words designated would go out.

Now, I submit here we have a case on all fours with the case decided at that time. We have a part of a paragraph that possibly standing alone would be in order. Yet there is nothing to show that it would reduce expenses if the several offices were abolished. But the other part of the paragraph, containing constructive legislation as to the duties and responsibilities of the officers not heretofore charged with this duty and responsi-

bility is out of order. I did not make a point of order against that alone but against the whole paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield for the Chair to ask a question?

Mr. FRENCH. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman distinguish this in any way from the paragraph in the former part of the bill abolishing the offices of the Subtreasuries?

Mr. FRENCH. I have not checked up closely on that, and I would not want to say. I think the point I have referred to is pertinent to this part of the paragraph. The whole paragraph involves two propositions—one of which is possibly in order if it stood alone. The other proposition is not in order under the rules of the House, and the whole paragraph must go with it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. FRENCH. I will yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It is plain that this would not reduce expenses. It will really increase the expenses, because in line 23, page 114, they appropriate \$175,000 for the transfer of the records to Washington.

Mr. FRENCH. The proposition of the gentleman adds to the suggestion I made a little while ago, that it is purely speculative whether or not it would reduce in any way the expenses of the Government for the coming year.

If the Chair will turn to volume 5, section 6880, of Hinds' Precedents, he will find the same question to which I referred a minute ago was passed upon when the naval appropriation bill, on February 25, 1904, was under consideration. Here an amendment was proposed by Mr. Bell, of California. Mr. Bell raised a parliamentary inquiry, asking if the point of order was sustained as to the entire amendment. The part of the amendment to which the point of order was made was ruled out, and the Chair made this observation:

It is well settled that where there is an amendment, any provision of which is out of order, the whole amendment falls with it.

It seems to me upon the considerations I have suggested, the tying up of the entire proposition in one paragraph, it being clearly demonstrated that one part of the paragraph is not in order, the fact that a part of the paragraph is not in order must carry the whole paragraph down with it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order that the paragraph entitled "Surveyors general" seeks to change existing law by legislation on a general appropriation bill and that the provision does not show upon its face, as a fair and necessary conclusion, that the enactment of such legislation will retrench expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HAYDEN. The present occupant of the chair has held that a saving of expenditure must appear beyond all cavil to make an amendment in order under the Holman rule. In considering whether an amendment will retrench expenditures the Chair can look only to the pending bill, the law of the land, and the rules and practices of the House.

The paragraph of the bill which is before the Chair contains five substantive propositions, any one of which may be enacted into law as an independent measure. The first proposal is that the surveyors general in the 12 Western States and the Territory of Alaska are abolished. If the Chair will look at the law he will ascertain that the aggregate salaries paid to these 13 officials is \$36,000. By the next proposal the surveyors general are required to deliver into the custody of the Commissioner of the General Land Office all field notes, records, and other papers, and all furniture and equipment of their respective offices. The transfer of such property is bound to cost money.

The proposal to transfer all of the powers now vested in the surveyors general to the Commissioner of the General Land Office might not indicate upon its face that the result will be a direct expense to the Government, but that expense will result from that transfer of authority is shown by the appropriation called for further along in the bill. It will also cost money to transfer the duplicate plats and records to the secretary of state of each State, as is further provided by reference to section 2218 of the Revised Statutes.

The fifth and last substantive proposition which is contained in the proviso on page 114 authorizes the transfer of records and clerks from the offices of the surveyors general to the General Land Office in Washington. Certainly no one will deny that it will cost considerable sums of money to make such a transfer, and the proof of that fact quickly follows.

I direct the attention of the Chair particularly to the following paragraph, beginning on line 19, page 14:

For per diem in lieu of subsistence, salaries, freight and expressage on records, instruments, and equipment shipped from the several offices, and the purchase of additional stationery, supplies, and equipment required in the General Land Office by reason of such transfer, \$175,000, including \$4,000 for salary of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

That is new legislation for the sole purpose of effecting this proposed transfer. It appears upon its face that a large expenditure of money, amounting to \$175,000, must be made to do the work in Washington now performed under the direction of the surveyors general in the Western States, and the sum to be appropriated obviously exceeds the \$36,000 which is supposed to be saved.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask the gentleman from Arizona the same question that he asked the gentleman from Idaho? Does the gentleman distinguish between this paragraph and the paragraph abolishing the Subtreasuries?

Mr. HAYDEN. Distinctly so. The provision abolishing the Subtreasuries was amended from the floor of the House by adopting section 2 of the bill H. R. 12721, introduced with that object in view by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which provides that all of the functions now performed by the Subtreasuries shall be transferred to the Federal reserve banks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not speaking of the Platt amendment, but of the item as carried in the bill originally.

Mr. HAYDEN. The item as it originally appeared in the bill was rejected and the Platt amendment was accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated that he would hold the item in order, following the precedents.

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not understand that the Chair actually ruled upon the original provision in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not have to rule upon it, because an amendment was offered striking it out; but the Chair stated at that time that he would have ruled it in order, following the decisions of Chairman CRISP and Chairman SAUNDERS on that precise question. The Chair wants to know if the gentleman makes any distinction between the item carried in the bill and this particular item.

Mr. HAYDEN. My attention was particularly directed to what actually took place. There was simply a transfer of jurisdiction from one bureau to the other, without carrying any expense or appropriation, as is provided in this case. It seems to me that if the Chair is confined to the terms of the bill before him, he must conclude that if an appropriation of \$175,000 is necessary to pay the salaries, freight, expressage, and so forth, on records and equipment shipped from the several offices of the surveyors general to Washington, and required in the General Land Office by reason of such transfer, he can not help but rule that on the face of the bill there will be a larger expenditure of money at this time than there would be if this proposed legislation was not enacted into law. That appropriation of \$175,000 refers directly to the last proviso of the pending section, which states that the clerical force and equipment in the offices of the surveyors general may be transferred to the General Land Office in Washington. It is my contention that in order to make such a transfer, as shown on the face of the bill, it will cost more money than will be saved by the abolishment of the offices of surveyors general.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman the point the gentleman is trying to make—that this does not show on its face that there will be any reduction in expenditure—is not well taken. Much stress is laid upon the fact that we provide in this bill in another paragraph \$175,000 for clerical force and for freight to defray the expense of shipment. I call the Chair's attention to the fact that it is disclosed in this paragraph that we abolish 13 distinct offices, 13 surveyors general, carrying a total salary of \$39,000; that we abolish the salaries of the clerks in these offices, to the amount of \$172,570, and contingent expenses amounting to \$12,300, making a total saving for the year 1920 of \$223,870. As against that, deduct this appropriation of \$175,000, and you have a net saving to the Treasury of \$48,870.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. In a moment. The clerical force of \$172,570, carried into the \$175,000, or deducted from it, leaves less than \$3,000 for freight, which would be an incidental expense.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. In just a moment. So that it does appear upon its face that it results in saving money to the Government and in retrenchment of expenditures. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. The gentleman suggests that the \$175,000 carried in the next paragraph pays the salaries of the clerical force. I submit that it provides for per diem and transportation and freight and so forth.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The gentleman is reading too far down in the paragraph. The very first line says that it is for

per diem in lieu of subsistence and salary. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, is there any guaranty at all that the amount of work would be done under the law for the coming fiscal year that was done in the year with which the gentleman is making the comparison?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is a matter that might be pertinent if we were arguing with reference to the feasibility of the abolishment of these offices, and upon that proposition I think I have abundant authority to show that the work will not be curtailed in the least, and that it will be more advantageous and expeditious to those immediately concerned than under the present operation.

Mr. FRENCH. Let me call attention to the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office for the last fiscal year. It is therein stated that it is shown that the office cost per mile of land surveyed was \$4.61, while the average cost throughout the United States, and that includes these surveyors general offices and all the western offices, was \$1.41 and \$2.08 per mile.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That argument is not pertinent to the point of order, but I would say in passing, in answer to the gentleman, that with the decline of this activity, with the necessity for public surveys constantly growing less, the expense proportionately constantly grows greater.

That would be a sufficient answer to the gentleman on that proposition.

Mr. FRENCH. But that does not answer it. Here is a proposition where the office force alone at Washington, that employs far more for doing this same kind of work than are employed in any office of any one of these States, where the cost per mile per unit is \$4 and something, in comparison with less than \$2 in the States where you are proposing to abolish the office.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will insist upon arguing the point of order. Now, with reference to the fact as to the germaneness of this proposition, the Chair looks to the law as it is, not as to any conjecture that might be thrown into it. He knows what the laws is, because it is demonstrated in the appropriation bill for 1920. He knows the proposal, because he has it immediately before him, and the two together show a net saving by the abolishment of these officers of \$48,870. This case is on all fours with the abolishment of the Subtreasuries.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. VAILE. I notice in the matter of the independent treasuries, page 65, there is no provision in the act as it was reported providing for the transfer of the duties of those officers.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is the trouble with the gentleman; he was not present and does not know what happened.

Mr. VAILE. The Chair referred in his discussion to the act as reported to the House, not what happened on the floor. The Chair's interrogatories to the gentleman from Arizona apparently are intended to base a conclusion upon the act as reported here to the House. Now, taking the act as reported to the House, the provision regarding the Subtreasuries shows nothing whatever about the transfer of the duties, whereas the provision in regard to the transfer of the office of surveyors general after June 30, 1920, etc., is that it shall be turned over to the General Land Office.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will say to the gentleman, for his edification, the previous ruling on this very Subtreasury proposition was based upon the proposition that carried the very same idea with reference to the transfer of duties and has been universally held in order—

Mr. VAILE. In any event, the case is not on all fours with these independent treasuries.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is on all fours with the independent treasury proposition. Now, I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the provision of the Platt amendment, which the Chair held in order:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to transfer any or all of the duties and functions performed or authorized to be performed by the assistant treasurers above enumerated, or their offices, to the Treasurer of the United States or the mints and assay offices of the United States, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, or to utilize any of the Federal reserve banks acting as depositories or fiscal agents of the United States, as provided by existing law, for the purpose of performing any or all of such duties and functions.

There was a transfer of the duties of these Subtreasuries to the Treasury of the United States. In the case at hand there is a transfer of the duties of these surveyors general to the Commissioner of the General Land Office absolutely parallel in so far as the situation is concerned. That being true, if it was proper to take and provide for the performance of the duties now incumbent upon the Subtreasuries by the transfer of their

duties to the Treasury of the United States, it is equally proper to provide by this proposal for the transfer of the duties of these surveyors general to the Commissioner of the General Land Office in the city of Washington. It strikes me it is not necessary to spend further time in arguing a proposition that is so perfectly plain and on which a ruling of the Chair has been so recently made.

Mr. RANDALL of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. RANDALL of California. I notice the committee has this proviso:

Provided, That so much of the clerical force in the offices of surveyors general as may be needed and such records as may be necessary may be transferred to the General Land Office in Washington.

Is it not possible under that provision to transfer the entire force to the General Land Office? Is not that possible?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Even if it were so, we are giving the benefit of the doubt so far as the saving is concerned if that would be true. As a matter of fact, it will not be done.

Mr. RANDALL of California. As a matter of fact, we do not make any reduction of the expenses of conducting these offices if the power which you give in the bill is exercised.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. We have cut off the salaries of 13 sinecures, pure and simple; sinecures which, so far as the duties they perform are concerned, might as well all be in Alaska as to be distributed throughout these States.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Was the gentleman ever in the office of a surveyor general in any of the public-land States, and does he know anything about their duties and work which they perform?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No. They were abolished in my State before I was born. In fact, there never were any.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. So the gentleman was never in the office of a surveyor general of a public-land State?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; I never was.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. But the gentleman speaks authoritatively and says that these places are sinecures, and that no duties are to be performed by these men?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. When opportunity is given, I think I can demonstrate it—demonstrate that it will prove a benefit to the service itself in avoiding tedious and vexatious delays and in greater efficiency.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Chair asked me a few moments ago to point out the distinction, if any, between the original provision of the bill with respect to the abolition of the Subtreasuries and the pending paragraph. The Chair will note on page 65 the bill as originally introduced did not provide for the transfer of the personnel from the Subtreasuries to the reserve banks, but merely gave to the employees who were legislated out of office a preference right under the civil-service law to secure position in the Treasury Department or any other branch of the Government. Let me read it:

All employees in the Subtreasuries in the classified civil service of the United States, who may so desire, shall be eligible for transfer to classified civil-service positions under the control of the Treasury Department, or if their services are not required in such department they may be transferred to fill vacancies in any other executive department with the consent of such department. To the extent that such employees possess required qualifications they shall be given preference over new appointments in the classified civil service under the control of the Treasury Department in the cities in which they are now employed.

The proviso beginning on line 13, page 114, reads:

Provided, That so much of the clerical force in the offices of surveyors general as may be needed and such records as may be necessary may be transferred to the General Land Office in Washington.

It is to this last proviso that I particularly direct the attention of the Chair, which seems to me makes the whole paragraph subject to the point of order, because it enacts new law for the transfer of a clerical force from the field into Washington. It is subsequently shown on the face of the pending bill that the expense of such a transfer, the salaries, and freight, and other items connected with it will amount to \$175,000, which amounts to very much more than the apparent saving in the salaries of the surveyors general.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the inquiry was made by the Chair whether this particular item could be distinguished from the Subtreasury item. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it can be very readily distinguished from that item. I do not gainsay at all the proposition that it is in order on an appropriation bill to abolish an existing system and provide another and different system, provided always that the Chair on the whole is satisfied that the alternative system so provided will effect a reduction of expenditures.

The Chair has heretofore overruled the precedents afforded by Mr. Chairman CRISP and others to the effect generally that

the Holman rule should be liberally construed, holding in express terms that if it was a question of drawing the conclusion that an item in the bill or an amendment from the floor afforded a reduction of expenditures the rule should be strictly construed, not liberally. Apply that ruling to this situation and let us see to what conclusion it will lead the Chair. What would be the proper conclusion should the Chair strictly construe the rule?

It is perfectly clear that while the bill abolishes the surveyors general in certain States, the work of those officials is not abolished. It is merely transferred. And the only question is whether the Chair can determine that this legislation on the whole will necessarily, *ex proprio vigore*, effect a reduction of expenditures; whether, in other words, the operating expenses of the system afforded will be less than the operating expenses of the system which it replaces.

I call the attention of the Chair to the transfer of the officials provided by the bill.

In line 13, page 114, it says:

That so much of the clerical force in the offices of surveyors general as may be needed and such records as may be necessary may be transferred to the General Land Office in Washington.

Every one of this force, and more, may be needed. How can the Chair determine how many officials will be transferred under this authority? Moreover, when these officials are transferred from the present localities where their work is being conducted to the remote location of Washington it will be altogether problematical whether the cost of operations on the whole will not be thereby increased. By what process of reasoning is the Chair able to say how many officials will be required in the new location to do the work necessary to be carried on, or what will be the cost of conducting operations from so distant a point as Washington?

The cost of transfer is problematical; the number of officials necessary to be transferred can not be ascertained at present, and the overhead cost of the new system is impossible of ascertainment by reference to any facts now in the possession of the Chair.

Another thing, as pointed out by the gentlemen who have argued this matter on behalf of their respective States, is that, as a matter of course, the work on the ground can be conducted much more economically with the headquarters of the chief officials in easy reach of the field force than when those headquarters are located in Washington and the officials must be sent to the field from this point. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] argued that the remarks of the gentleman from Idaho on this line did not touch the point of order, even though the figures submitted by that gentleman established his contention that operations conducted from Washington would be more expensive than operations based on headquarters in the several States. So far, Mr. Chairman, from these figures not being related to the point of order, they are of the very essence of the point of order, since it is necessary for the Chair to contrast the figures of the present system with the problematical figures of the alternative system. This provision is not in order, unless the Chair is satisfied that, on the whole, the replacement system will be more economical than the present system.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. HAYDEN. I would like to state that there is annually appropriated \$700,000, every cent of which is expended in the survey of public lands under the supervision of the surveyors general. So it is not alone a question of saving their salaries.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am seeking to point out, that the overhead under the new system may be so much greater than under the old, that it will swallow up the reduction appearing from the figures of the gentleman from Indiana. If that may be the case, and the Chair is not able to say that it may not reasonably be the case, then the provision as a whole is not in order.

On page 114 a very large amount is appropriated in this connection, as follows: For per diem in lieu of subsistence, salaries, freight, and expressage on records, and so forth, \$175,000. The gentleman from Indiana takes this appropriation into consideration in his effort to show a reduction but he entirely fails to establish that on the whole this alternative system can be run more economically than the system that it is to replace. As stated above, unless it appears that the new system operating as a whole will be more economical than the old the paragraph is not in order. That is what is involved here. The Chair, as I have said, has already held, with respect to the Holman rule, that there can be no liberality of construction in respect to the conclusion of reduction of expenditures, but that it must appear beyond cavil or controversy that on the whole this reduction will be effected.

Every gentleman from the States affected by this provision who has argued this matter has pointed out (and the Chair should take cognizance of their suggestions, equally as well as of the suggestions of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], because both are merely arguments) that the overhead expenses in connection with operating the new system will be much greater than under the old. How much greater, Mr. Chairman, no one can say. Hence the cost of the new system is altogether problematical.

That brings us, Mr. Chairman, to the very crux of this matter, and that is whether the Chair, looking to the paragraph as a whole, can undertake to say definitely how much of the present force will be transferred to Washington and when transferred here what will be the cost of its establishment, maintenance, and operation at such a distance from the field of immediate activity. The Chair must be satisfied beyond cavil that the new system on the whole will be cheaper than the old, to sustain the paragraph under discussion. The Chair in reaching a conclusion of reduction should first determine reasonably the number of officials necessary to be transferred; second, the cost of establishing and maintaining them in the new location; third, the cost of conducting operations in the States with Washington as a headquarters. When the Chair has found a reasonable answer in figures to these three queries he will be able to make a comparison between the known cost of the present system and the cost of the alternative system, and to determine which of the two on the whole will be the cheaper. Of course, it is perfectly clear that if the bill stopped at abolishing the surveyors general a palpable retrenchment would be effected and the paragraph would be in order.

But when the transfers are provided for and an alternative system is afforded and headquarters so remote from the territory where the work is to be conducted are established, then the Chair is unable to say how many agents will need to be transferred, how many will be necessary for the conduct of the business from the new headquarters, and how great the overhead cost of the new system will be. In this state of uncertainty how can the Chair say that the new system will necessarily be cheaper than the old? How can he make a comparison between the two until he establishes to his satisfaction the essential facts of the new system? How can he, construing the Holman rule strictly as applied to the conclusion of reduction, undertake to say that he has enough facts in hand to make a comparison? And until he can make a fair comparison how can he reach a conclusion that the new system will be more economical than the old?

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself for a moment to some of the arguments advanced by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] in support of his point of order.

If I judge correctly, his argument was based largely upon the proposition that under the Holman rule the legislation proposed in the latter part of the paragraph should be held not in order, because it is not reported by a committee having jurisdiction and, further, that it is not properly related to the first part of the proposition, abolishing the surveyors general, as to make it in order in case the Chair holds that part of the item in order. We all know the Holman rule so well that it would be a burden for me to quote it. I gather from the argument of the gentleman from Idaho that he assumes that the latter part of the Holman rule—the proviso—limits the first three elements of the rule.

Mr. FRENCH. No; I think it enlarges it; but this is not comprehended within the provision.

Mr. HICKS. In my opinion the proviso in the Holman rule merely adds another vehicle by which legislation can be carried in an appropriation bill. Should I need reinforcement to my contention, I would quote from a ruling of Chairman CRISP on March 14, 1916, when in discussing the proviso he said, "It provides an additional method of legislating on an appropriation bill." Chairman SAUNDERS, on February 9, 1912, said, in discussing the Holman rule, "That proviso allows further amendments on the report of the committee having jurisdiction, provided they reduce expenditures."

It seems to me that the gentleman's contention that the several propositions which follow the one abolishing the surveyors general are not in order is not well taken. He admits, I think, that the salaries and a number of offices are reduced in the committee proposition, but contends that the following propositions of the same paragraph are not so related to the first part, reducing the offices and the salaries, as to come within the rule. I think, from the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], we can assume that the salary and number of offices will be reduced if this paragraph remains in the bill. The language admits of no doubt. I think the

gentleman from Idaho practically admitted that there would be that reduction. To me it is not problematical; it is positive. Some have contended that the removal of the offices to Washington will increase expenditures. I submit this is pure guesswork and therefore outside the province of the Chairman to pass upon as a reduction. Then, the gentleman brings up the point whether or not these other legislative provisions in the paragraph, three or four of them, are so related to that "reduction in the salary and number of offices" as to come within the purview of the Holman rule. Let me state that in my opinion they are properly related. They are not independent, substantive propositions. They can not be divorced from what goes before, for they simply provide the ways and means of carrying on the work when the surveyors are abolished. They are useless when considered by themselves and have vitality only when harnessed to the first part of the paragraph, and therefore must be considered as an integral part of the whole paragraph. Let me quote to the Chair a decision which I think is directly in line with what my contention is—that these several clauses are a part of one proposition and are therefore in order if the first part is in order. I argue that the second and third parts of this paragraph are so related to the part which reduces salary and offices as to be indivisible.

On March 14, 1916, we had before the committee an appropriation bill, and the late Mr. Borland, of Missouri, sought to amend that bill by adding an amendment providing for the reduction by one-tenth of the number of employees in the various departments in Washington, and then he added words which provided "that the heads of the departments, in order to make that work more efficient and to prevent loss to the Government, shall require the employees to work not less than eight hours a day," and so forth.

A point of order was made to that by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], both he and Mr. Borland conceding that the provision about reductions was in order. The Chairman, Mr. CRISP, of Georgia, ruled that the first part of Mr. Borland's amendment providing for a reduction of salaries was undoubtedly in order, and that therefore the only question for the Chair to decide was whether or not the second part, which compelled the heads of departments to require additional work on the part of the employees, was so related to the first part as to be in order; and the Chairman held that that relation did exist, and therefore held the whole amendment to be in order.

I will quote to the Chair, with his permission, the decision of Chairman CRISP on that occasion, because it seems to me directly in line with the point of order that we are now discussing. I read:

Now, the Chair is clearly of opinion that where an amendment is offered reducing the salaries paid out of the Treasury, coupled with legislation, that legislation, to be in order, must be connected up with, or related to, or logically follow from the part of the amendment reducing the number of employees or the amounts covered by the bill.

And so forth; and he held the whole amendment in order. In my opinion this is on all fours with the proposition before us to-day, and if the Chairman holds that the reduction of officers is in order—and I respectfully submit he can not do otherwise—then I contend he must hold it all in order and will therefore overrule the point of order made against it.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Chair to one feature of the expense involved in this matter that has not yet been discussed. I find provision is made that the joint committee shall provide the necessary additional space in the Interior Department for the employees to be brought to Washington under the provisions of this section if it is adopted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Interior Department building today is all occupied. I grant you that the committee referred to in this section would have the power to take out of that building some bureau or some sections of bureaus and place them elsewhere, but if they did that they must somewhere in this city rent the space to put the employees taken out. We are now paying great sums of money for rentals in the District of Columbia, and I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that these offices of surveyors general in the West to-day are located in public buildings, where rent is not a feature or an item that is to be considered. That will have to be considered here if these employees are brought to the city of Washington to be housed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desire to be heard?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Not if the Chair is prepared to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The point of order made by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] involves not only a question of the interpretation of the rules of

the House but a question of fact. The Chair thinks that it would first be proper to dispose of the question of fact.

The gentleman from Idaho and others intimate that possibly this would not be a real reduction of the expenditures of the Government. The Chair has before him the current law relating to the subject matter, which provides an appropriation of \$223,870 for offices of surveyors general, of which the sum of \$39,000 is salaries of surveyors general. This paragraph abolishes all the offices of surveyors general, and carries in the next paragraph an appropriation of \$175,000.

Clearly on the face of this item there is a saving of \$48,870. Under these circumstances would the Chair be justified in assuming that possibly such matters as have been alluded to just now by the gentleman from South Dakota, high rent of public buildings, and so forth, might result in a larger eventual expenditure?

The Chair is unable to distinguish between this proposition and the one abolishing the Subtreasuries. The present occupant of the chair some years ago made precisely the argument that has been made here, that while on the face of it the abolishment of the Subtreasuries saved money in that it abolished the offices, it might eventually cost more to transfer the employees, and not result, ultimately, in a saving of money; but the present occupant of the chair was overruled on that proposition, and he thinks rightly.

The Chair does believe that the Holman rule should be construed strictly, as the gentleman from Virginia has said. The Chair has not ruled and will not rule that an item can come under the Holman rule if it does not show on its face that it saves money to the Government. The Chair will not speculate where it is not apparent on the face of the item that it will retrench expenditures. Conversely the Chair does not think that he ought to speculate where on the face of the item, as here, there is an evident saving in this bill of \$48,870, or that he is justified in guessing that eventually the expenses might be greater. On the question of fact then the Chair is clear in his mind that this is a saving of money to the Government by the abolition of the offices of the surveyors general. Now, that being the case, and this being a change of existing law, does it come under the Holman rule?

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] makes as his principal point on that subject the question of jurisdiction of the committee. He claims that the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction over the original subject matter, and to sustain that contention he refers to the proviso of the Holman rule. Now, the Chair thinks that the proviso has nothing whatever to do with the main part of the Holman rule as applied to items originally brought in in a bill. This is an item contained in the bill brought in by the Committee on Appropriations, and under the Chair's construction of the Holman rule it is not necessary that that committee must show jurisdiction of the original subject matter.

The Chair further believes that under the Holman rule it would be competent for a Member on the floor to offer an amendment, provided it came under the first part of the Holman rule. To the mind of the Chair the proviso of the Holman rule does not, as he has stated, relate either to original items or amendments offered on the floor in the first instance, because the proviso applies only to further amendments. In other words, in the opinion of the Chair the proviso in the Holman rule expands rather than contracts its scope.

The question then resolves itself into one as to whether the provision carried in this bill brought in by the Committee on Appropriations qualifies under the first part of the Holman rule, which reads as follows:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures, by the reduction of the number and salaries of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of the amounts of money carried by the bill.

To the mind of the Chair this matter is absolutely clear. There is no question that this item is entirely germane to the bill. The only question then is, Does it by a reduction of the number and salaries of the officers of the United States retrench expenditures? Clearly it does. It specifically reduces the number of officers, it specifically abolishes their salaries, and it specifically reduces the amount of money carried by this bill. Under the circumstances the Chair can not think that he can make any other ruling except to overrule the point of order.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: Page 113, line 13, strike out line 13 and the remainder of page 113 and all of page 114, down to and including line 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For salaries of surveyors general, clerks in their offices, and contingent expenses, including office rent, pay of messengers, stationery, printing, binding, drafting instruments, typewriters, furniture, fuel, lights, books of reference for office use, post-office box rent, and other incidental expenses, including the exchange of typewriters, as follows: "Alaska: Surveyor general and ex officio secretary of the Territory, \$4,000; clerks, \$11,220; contingent expenses, \$3,600; in all, \$18,820.

"Arizona: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$18,400; contingent expenses, \$600; in all, \$22,000.

"California: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$14,100; contingent expenses, \$650; in all, \$17,750.

"Colorado: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$18,650; contingent expenses, \$750; in all, \$22,400.

"Idaho: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$12,600; contingent expenses, \$750; in all, \$16,350.

"Montana: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$16,980; contingent expenses, \$600; in all, \$20,580.

"Nevada: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$12,060; contingent expenses, \$500; in all, \$15,560.

"New Mexico: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$18,900; contingent expenses, \$900; in all, \$22,800.

"Oregon: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$9,510; contingent expenses, \$600; in all, \$13,110.

"South Dakota: Surveyor general, \$2,000; clerk, \$3,100; contingent expenses, \$200; in all, \$5,300.

"Utah: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$14,020; contingent expenses, \$725; in all, \$17,745.

"Washington: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, 11,260; contingent expenses, \$750; in all, \$15,010.

"Wyoming: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$10,540; contingent expenses, \$500; in all, \$14,040.

"Expenses chargeable to the foregoing appropriations for clerk hire and incidental expenses in the offices of the surveyors general shall not be incurred by the respective surveyors general in the conduct of said offices, except upon previous specific authorization by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to detail temporarily clerks from the office of one surveyor general to another as the necessities of the service may require and to pay their actual necessary traveling expenses in going to and returning from such office out of the appropriation for surveying the public lands. A detailed statement of traveling expenses incurred hereunder shall be made to Congress at the beginning of each regular session thereof.

"The use of the fund created by the act of March 2, 1895 (28th Stats., p. 937), for office work in the surveyors general offices is extended for one year from June 30, 1920: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of this fund shall be used for the purposes above indicated."

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of gentlemen interested in this proposition. I think, before we begin the discussion of it, we had better agree upon the time for debate.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I am in sympathy with the report of the committee, I am willing that these gentlemen who oppose the committee shall select some one else to control the time on this side; or, if they desire me to do so, I am willing to control the time. It might be better to agree upon some one else; and, if the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] or the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] or any of the others are willing to divide the time among themselves, any agreement they make with the chairman of the subcommittee will be agreeable to me.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There are 12 States involved and 1 Territory. Will they want more than one Representative from each State to talk?

Mr. Sisson. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Some of the States may not want any time.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman indicate how much time is desired?

Mr. Sisson. Gentlemen on this side of the aisle desire 60 minutes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is there no one over there to stand up in favor of the committee proposition?

Mr. Sisson. I have just stated to the Chair that I was in sympathy with the report of the subcommittee.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I knew that.

Mr. Sisson. I am speaking for myself only. I can not tell about other gentlemen.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I wondered if anybody on the Democratic side except the gentleman from Mississippi was in favor of economy.

Mr. Sisson. I want five minutes for myself. I suggest two hours on a side.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will state that all the gentlemen who have asked for time, with the possible exception of one, are in opposition to the provision contained in the bill. So it occurs to me that there should not be so much time taken in opposition to it and so little time in favor of the bill.

Mr. Sisson. That might strengthen the position of the committee, however. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I ask that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to two hours, one-half in favor of the bill and one-half against it, because of the fact that gentlemen who are in opposition to the bill are so numerous.

Mr. Sisson. I will retain five minutes of the time for myself, because I am going to speak in favor of the committee's report.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Let us agree on two hours' debate.

Mr. Sisson. That is satisfactory.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have a list of the gentlemen who have asked for time on this side, and the gentleman from Mississippi has a list of those who asked for time on that side, and I will control one half of the time and he the other half.

Mr. Sisson. That is satisfactory.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments be limited to two hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] and one-half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to two hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Mississippi. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it in order to enter into such an agreement in Committee of the Whole where the time is to be divided?

The CHAIRMAN. It is by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Members, I would say that the amendment I have proposed is based on the language of the last current appropriation law. The particular items, however, have been modified, in some instances increased and in other instances decreased, so as to meet the estimates of the Department of the Interior in the recommendations made to the Congress. The net total in the amendment I have proposed is a little over \$2,000 less than the amount carried in the current law.

The paragraph which the committee has reported proposes to wipe out all the surveyors general offices in 12 States and 1 Territory, to do away with the work as it has been done for years, and to transfer the work and jurisdiction to the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

I recognize that there must come a time when this shall be done. From year to year as the different States that were public-land States approached the completion of surveys of their public lands it came to be too large an expense to maintain the surveyors general in those particular States. Then the offices have been abolished and the work taken over by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

The whole matter of public-land surveys is one that has had to do with all our States. The States along the Atlantic seaboard handled it for themselves, and so did the State of Texas. But the other States were public-land States, yet they are not so to-day. There is no surveyor general in any of the States as you go west until you reach the Dakotas and Colorado, and the reason is there is no public land or little public land unsurveyed. The work is pinching out in all the States. But the work to-day is in such shape in the 12 States and 1 Territory that in my judgment it is not wise to abolish the offices of the surveyors general in most of them.

Let me call attention to the lands in the several States that are still unsurveyed. Up to June 30, 1919, 1,261,136,954 acres of public land had been surveyed within the United States. We have unsurveyed land amounting to 559,229,126 acres. These lands to which I have referred that have been surveyed are largely in States where there are no surveyors general. The lands that are not surveyed are in the States to which I have referred where there are to-day surveyors general. To-day, according to these figures, approximately one-third of the land within the United States and Alaska has not been surveyed. Idaho is one-third unsurveyed; Utah more than one-third; New Mexico is one-fourth unsurveyed; and Arizona three-fifths. Colorado has nearly 3,000,000 acres not yet surveyed and Washington nearly 8,000,000 acres, while most of the States whose surveyors general offices you propose to abolish have vastly more.

Is it the orderly thing to do, is it the economical thing to do, in this stage of our surveying work, for us to abolish the policy that has obtained for 100 years, to abolish surveyors

general offices in the various States and transfer all the work to the Commissioner of the General Land Office in Washington, regardless of the status of the surveys? I submit that it is not. We have had much experience in the West in doing business with officers 2,000 miles away, and we do not like it.

Let me call attention to another fact: You take the lands in these public-land States and you will find that they are being entered upon by homesteaders or other entrymen under the various land laws. I was very much surprised the other day when turning to the records of last year I saw that the number of acres of land acquired by private individuals under the public land and other land laws last year was in excess of 11,000,000 acres. And when I turned to the records to see how many acres passed to patent last year under the homestead laws I found the grand total was 6,524,759.68 acres. I found there were only six years in the whole period of land history of our country when the acreage acquired by settlers under the homestead laws was in excess of the acreage that was acquired last year under the homestead laws. Of course, it is true that in part this is accounted for by the enlarged homesteads and by the stock-grazing homesteads. Numerically, probably the number of entrymen is smaller than it was for many years past, but at the same time the number of entrymen must be large when the total acreage is six and one-half million acres, and when there were only six years in the past when the lands acquired exceeded in acreage the lands acquired last year.

Now, let me call attention to the receipts from the public-land States. The total receipts of the public-land States under the different land laws are in excess of \$495,000,000. The receipts of public-land States last year were in excess of \$4,000,000, and with the exception of four or five years from 1906 to 1912, when, under the enlarged-homestead law and under the development of the Reclamation Service, the receipts were increased tremendously, the receipts last year compare very favorably with the receipts covering a great many years. These three points to which I have referred are pertinent because they show the tremendous interest of people in the public-land States in the work that is conducted by the offices of the surveyors general. It shows the importance of the work, and it is important that these offices should be retained in the several States, so that the people who are interested in this work can have ready access to them.

Now, what does the surveyor general do? Prior to some 10 years ago he was trusted with the responsibility of awarding contracts for surveys. To-day the contract-work plan is not followed, but the Government handles the work through its own officers and surveying parties. The surveying parties in a given State return to the surveyor general's office with their survey notes of field work done. These notes are worked over and plats are made. Errors that are disclosed are corrected, and if necessary a surveyor can return to the land he has surveyed without crossing the continent and check up on his work. After the plat has been made and the notes transcribed, one set is sent to the Land Office at Washington for final approval and one set is retained at the office of the surveyor general for public use.

Mineral-survey applications are made, and the surveyor general upon a proper showing authorizes a deputy mineral surveyor to do the work. The surveyor general's office receives the money to cover the office cost of the survey and the survey proceeds.

There is a vast amount of detailed information requested of the surveyor general's office every day. It is requested by miners and by farmers, by settlers and prospectors, by county officers, by courts, and by the State. In the 12 States and the Territory of Alaska under the surveyors general are 119 clerks, draftsmen, or other office help. These people are rendering a distinct service to the public. The West is in the building, and we do not like to do business with executive officers two or three thousand miles removed when we can transact the same business with officers near at home. Suppose you could save a little in overhead charges. The people in the West would pay for it, and more than pay for it, in extra cost for service in long delays and in waste of valuable time. Gentlemen, other than is necessary for systematic conduct of the public business, the people will welcome closer contact with their public officials and not remoteness, which leads to bureaucratic government.

Let me call attention again to the fact that the overhead charges, the office charges, are not greater in most of these States than the overhead charges in conducting the same work in the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, if I read correctly the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office. In three of the States, I believe, the average office charges are larger than the office charges here, but in all of the other States the average charge is much less than the aver-

age charge for office work in the surveying division in the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office. The average cost is one-half or less in these different public-land States from the standpoint of mile unit of land surveyed in handling the work under the surveyors general of the different States than when the same work is handled under the supervision of the General Land Office, with the office located from two to three thousand miles away, and when you think of Alaska, 5,000 miles, from the place where the land is situated that is being surveyed. I wired to the surveyor general of my State and he advises that if the work of the assistant supervisors of survey could be combined with that of the surveyor general, under the direction of the latter, an economy could be effected. I wired to a preceding surveyor general and he says that possibly a saving of \$50,000 can be made to the Government by the proposition that has been recommended by Mr. Tallman and by the Committee on Appropriations, but he says that when you are making the saving to the Government you are going to add more than you will save to the people in these public-land States, who, because of their remoteness from the Capital where the work shall be done, will be compelled to pay out of their own pockets for the handling of useless work. I admit that as the work of the surveyor general's office pinches out it should be abolished, but why abolish the offices in States where the work has not been pinched out and where it continues and will for several years continue exceedingly heavy?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH]. Congress should not attempt to change a long-established policy of this Government at this time, as has been proposed by the Committee on Appropriations. The law now provides for an orderly way in which the offices of surveyors general shall be dispensed with. When the survey of the lands in any State is completed the Secretary of the Interior has authority to then abolish the office and transfer such duties as may remain to the Commissioner of the General Land Office. This summary proposal, when there yet remain in the Western States vast areas of land to be surveyed, is premature, untimely, and in the end will not be economical for the Government.

The total area of vacant public land in Arizona on July 1, 1919, was 20,714,785 acres, of which 13,572,200 acres was unsurveyed. Last year 1,762,639 acres were surveyed in my State. At that rate it will take nearly eight years to survey the remaining public domain, but surveying must proceed at least that fast to meet the demand for land by settlers.

The Indian reservations in Arizona comprise 21,884,682 acres, of which less than 3,000,000 acres have been surveyed. The Indian country must in time be surveyed by section and township, and Congress is annually appropriating money for that purpose, which is expended under the direct supervision of the surveyors general. It is evident that there are many years' work ahead in surveying the Indian lands in Arizona alone.

That is not all, however, for there are 12,076,769 acres in forest reserves in Arizona, only about one-half of which has been surveyed. In order to prevent quantities of merchantable timber from being acquired under the homestead laws many forest homestead entries must be surveyed by metes and bounds which, like all other surveys, must be approved by the surveyor general. Arizona was granted 10,489,236 acres of public land in aid of the common schools and for other purposes by the act admitting the State into the Union. None of this land can be selected until it is surveyed, and the State land commission is continually filing applications for new surveys in order that title to the lands donated by Congress may pass to the State.

Another uncompleted work of the surveyor general of Arizona is the survey of the remainder of the 3,218,469 acres granted by Congress in alternate sections to encourage the construction of the Atlantic & Pacific—now Santa Fe Pacific—Railroad. The railway company deposits money for such surveys which are now in progress. Mining claims must also be surveyed prior to patent at the expense of the claimant, and the recent regulations governing mineral leases on Indian reservations require all such claims to be regularly surveyed before a lease will be granted. Owing to the value of the mining properties involved, the supervision of mineral surveys constitutes a very important part of the duties of the surveyor general, the proper performance of which is of vital interest to the great mining regions of the West.

I have gone into details with respect to the situation in Arizona in order to demonstrate the inconvenience, expense, and hardship which will be imposed on large numbers of people repre-

sented many and varied interests if this new method of conducting the survey of the public lands is adopted. At the close of the last fiscal year the total area of unsurveyed land in Arizona was 31,028,155 acres, which is 7,500,000 acres greater than the entire area of Indiana.

The State of Indiana was once an unsurveyed wilderness, but the Congress of the United States brought order out of chaos by having the entire State surveyed, and every acre of it has passed into private ownership. In 1796 a surveyor general was provided for the territory northwest of the Ohio River for the convenience of those who were seeking homes on what was then the frontier. This surveyor general's office was maintained until 1857, when every township in Ohio and Indiana had been surveyed. It is my contention that the people of Arizona are entitled to the same service and the same consideration as was given to the people of Indiana under similar circumstances.

How can the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], who is in charge of this great appropriation bill, justify the proposal he has made? It has been demonstrated that no real economy will be effected. It has been proven that the service will be impaired. It has been shown beyond a doubt that all those who desire surveys to be made will suffer greater inconvenience and expense. The existing law contemplates that in due course of time, when all of the land in any State is surveyed, the office of surveyor general will be discontinued. Until that time comes, why should the people of Arizona and the West be denied the same advantages which have heretofore been provided for every other public land State? [Applause.]

We are told that this legislation is recommended by Commissioner Tallman. Now, I have a very high regard for the Commissioner of the General Land Office. No one has brought greater ability to that office since its establishment than Clay Tallman. He is not only a man of sound judgment but also possesses the capacity to accomplish results both by his own efforts and as an organizer and administrator. The Members of this House receive quicker and better responses to their inquiries from the General Land Office to-day than from any other bureau of the Government, because the commissioner has kept the work in Washington current despite the war demands and other obstacles. In that regard Mr. Tallman may be compared to Gen. McCain when the latter was in charge of The Adjutant General's Office, and I know of no higher compliment than that to pay to any bureau chief.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office said at the hearings that in his opinion some money could be saved if the 13 surveyors general offices were discontinued and the entire public-land survey service conducted from Washington. Of course, he is sincere in that opinion, but did anyone ever hear of a first-class bureau chief who did not honestly believe that economy and efficiency would surely follow an increase in his powers? Everyone of them who is worth his salt will say that, because they have faith in themselves, without which they would be unfit for positions of responsibility. But actual experience has taught the Members of Congress that such expectations are not always realized, the usual result being an increase in appropriations with no greater service to the public.

In the present instance I fear that the Commissioner of the General Land Office has allowed a very natural desire for greater authority to warp his usual good judgment. What is the sum of money involved in the salaries of the surveyors general? The total saving if the offices are abolished is only \$36,000. Yet Congress annually appropriates \$700,000 for the survey of the public lands, the expenditure of every cent of which would normally be under the supervision of the surveyors general. We are told that this will reduce overhead expenses. Is 5½ per cent too high a charge for supervision? Ask any experienced contractor and he will tell you that a much higher rate is usually charged in private work. Some competent man must be in close touch with the surveying parties in the field or mistakes will be made and expenses incurred which will amount each year to much more than the alleged saving by the discontinuance of these positions.

If all of the surveyors general are thus summarily removed from office, does anyone imagine that the Commissioner of the General Land Office will himself perform all of the work that these 13 men have been doing, even though Congress shall enact fiction into law by saying that all of their authority, powers, and duties shall be vested in the commissioner? I am confident that I know what will happen, and I can fortify my forecast by reading the following extract from the commissioner's last annual report:

The work of the eastern surveying district includes the miscellaneous fragmentary public-land surveys and examinations and Indian surveys in those States where the former United States surveyor general offices have been discontinued. The active work of the past year extended into nine States, as follows: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida,

Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin. The commissioner, as ex officio United States surveyor general, performs all of the duties incident to authorizing and approving the surveys, ordinarily required of the surveyors general. (Sec. 88, R. S. 2219.) The field work in this surveying district is placed under the immediate charge of the associate supervisor of surveys, who reports both to the commissioner and to the supervisor of surveys. Surveyors are detailed to this district as needed, the number averaging from five to eight. One technical examiner and computer and one draftsman, both in the office of the supervisor of surveys at Denver, Colo., now prepare most of the plats of the surveys.

It will be noted that the Commissioner of the General Land Office acts as ex officio surveyor general for the nine States named, but he delegates the work to an associate supervisor of surveys who reports to the supervisor of surveys in Denver. There are none but fragmentary tracts of land remaining to be surveyed in these States and, at most, only eight surveyors are employed. One general commands eight privates in this instance. With over 70,000,000 acres of unsurveyed land in the 12 Western States and 375,000,000 acres to be surveyed in Alaska, is it not certain that numerous associate supervisors of surveys will have to be appointed?

"A rose under any other name would smell as sweet," and "One can not get something for nothing," are two proverbs which are as true as they are ancient. Congress may change the title of the office from surveyor general to associate supervisor of surveys, but money must be appropriated to pay good salaries if first-class and efficient men are to be obtained for the new positions. In my opinion the net result of this change will not be a retrenchment in expenditures. There will be no material reduction in the number of supervisory officials, but instead of having surveyors general appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, there will be selected by the Commissioner of the General Land Office about the same number of associate supervisors of surveys. Instead of being selected from the States where their offices are located and therefore anxious to give good service to their fellow citizens, as is now the case with the surveyors general, their successors, with a longer title, will be but cogs in a great governmental machine responsible to no one but a superior officer who occupies a desk in Washington two or three thousand miles away.

The enactment of legislation abolishing the offices of surveyors general is but another step in the direction of centralization in Washington of business which experience has demonstrated should be supervised in the field. When the office of surveyor general was first established in 1796 it was recognized by Congress that the settlers on the public domain were entitled to prompt service in the surveys of their entries which could only be given by an official in the vicinity clothed with authority to act. The Ohio and Mississippi Valleys and the Great Plains region were successfully populated by this method. If the people of Ohio and Indiana and Illinois and Iowa and Kansas enjoyed this advantage so long as there was public land to be surveyed in those States, why should the people of Arizona and California and New Mexico and Colorado and all the West be now deprived of equally good service and compelled to look to an official in Washington for relief?

The West is now suffering from too much control by the executive departments. Instead of further concentration of power at the seat of government many activities should be decentralized. Instead of attempting to coordinate and standardize every activity by arbitrary revolving-chair regulations with the resulting formality and crystallization there should be a greater dispersion of initiative and responsibility. By this method alone can the reign of bureaucracy be curbed and the perplexing and paralyzing effect of official obstacles and red tape be obviated. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty accord with the earnest desire of the Committee on Appropriations and the leaders in the House to reduce appropriations wherever advisable to do so, but I think they should exercise better judgment in the appropriations that are to be reduced than that indicated in this instance. I do not criticize the chairman of the subcommittee for his determination to prevent changes being made in the bill reported to the House, but I do criticize the committee's plan to move to the city of Washington the records in the surveyors general offices concerning the public lands in the various public-land States. I also criticize his assumption and the assumption of other members of the committee that they know more about the western country than the men who are elected by the people there to represent them here in Washington. Now, what is the mode of procedure of the committee in reference to acquiring the information in the framing of this bill? The subcommittee convenes, composed of five members, and holds hearings, calling before it the executive officers of the

departments to be affected, but so far as I can ascertain they do not make any inquiry of the Representatives in Congress coming from the sections of the country that are to be affected by these proposed reductions. The chairman of the subcommittee admitted on this floor that he had not called into consultation any Representative from that great western country concerning the plan of changing a policy affecting the survey of our public lands which has been in force for nearly a century. Ninety-eight years ago on the 3d of next March a law was passed establishing the office of surveyor general, and now it is proposed to change this policy to the great inconvenience of the people in the West and the retardation of the development of the resources of that great western country. If the gentleman had taken the trouble to have searched the statutes he would have learned that there is a general law under which transfer of records are made when the surveys are completed. In 1893 general authority was given to the Secretary of the Interior to take care of the records affecting the public lands in States where the lands have all been surveyed. The law provided that those records instead of being brought to Washington, as proposed in this bill, should be placed in the office of the secretary of state in the State where the lands are located. He would have found in the act of 1888 that the surveyors general offices in the States of Nebraska and Iowa were abolished and a provision was made that those records should be kept in the office of the secretary of state, so as to make them accessible to the people, and not brought to Washington, as proposed.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I will.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The provision for the same purpose is the same in this bill for every one of those States.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Here is the provision to which the gentleman refers—section 2221 of the Revised Statutes. That section provides that those records can not be turned over to the secretary of state until the State passes a law making some provision for taking care of the records. Now I contend, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a very great inconvenience to the people of the public-land States who have business affecting titles to the public land transacted in Washington instead of at the State capital. When a number of settlers in an unsurveyed portion of the State desire a survey made they sign a petition and send it to the surveyor general, and he sends an agent immediately to inquire whether or not these are actual settlers who intend to remain there. If they are, he recommends a survey of those lands, draws up instructions to the surveyors who are to do the work, and transmits them to Washington for approval. They are generally approved immediately, because there is nothing more required than a formal approval, and the authority to survey the land goes back to the surveyor general and the work is undertaken. Immediately after the surveys are made and approved by the commissioner the settlers are able to file their claims in the local land office.

In the case with respect to mining claims, if a person develops a piece of mineral land which he thinks can be profitably developed and he desires to offer final proof, he does not have to take the matter up at Washington, but simply files an application for a survey, making the necessary deposit to do the work with the surveyor general, and he details a surveyor to do this work, the applicant for the mining claim pays for it, and it is disposed of directly from the office of the surveyor general.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER. I will yield the gentleman two minutes of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that it would not be a saving of the public money to bring these records here. On the contrary, it would cost a great many thousand dollars to move them to Washington. I venture to say it would take 50 box cars to bring the records from these various public-land States, which have been accumulating, some of them, for 75 years. It would also result in a suspension of public business, affecting the rights of title to public land during the time these records are being assembled and removed, and it would require a great deal of expense in the employment of laborers and other employees to take care of the records. They would have to be gathered in these various surveyors general offices and be classified, and at least six months would transpire before they could be assembled here. So I contend that the interests of the public would not be benefited but would be greatly injured by this proposition in the various public-land States by the adoption of this plan. It would be just as sensible, in my judgment, to remove all the records from every county in the State of Indiana affecting the title to land to the capital city at Indianapolis, the home of the chairman of the subcommittee, and put them in one great hall of records as to move all the records affecting the

public lands in the various Western States to the city of Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. What good is this two hours' talk going to do on this proposition when we have only about 30 men in the House now? Why not have this debate cut down and eliminated. We know how we are going to vote, and what is the use of wasting two hours' time?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I am perfectly willing to vote—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this amendment of the gentleman from Idaho, and my people feel that this office of surveyor general in my State and the office of the surveyor general in all of the Western States are important to them. They are a great aid in the conduct of their business. There are millions of acres of land yet unsurveyed and yet to be settled. There are thousands of people who annually come and inspect those lands. There were perhaps more entries made last year than in the history of this country, or at least in the history of the western country.

It is important that these men have access to the records in order to find out about these surveys. I anticipate that the gentlemen on this floor do not know what the situation is about the offices of the surveyors general in the States. Surveys are made on the ground and plats are made there. They are perfected there. They are then sent to Washington and approved and returned to those offices. If some surveyor, or some attorney, or some applicant for land wants to know anything about it, he goes to the surveyor general's office, or he goes to his attorney, who goes to the surveyor general's office. And if these records should be sent to the General Land Office in Washington they will be 2,000 miles away. It will be an imposition upon those people to compel them to come to Washington or to send to Washington. Immediate contact can not be made between the individual who is interested in these matters that could be made if the records are kept in Montana or in the other States.

There is a growing disposition upon the part of this House and the people of the eastern countries to feel that the West is getting something that it does not deserve, perhaps. There is a growing disposition to take from us some of the things we have had for years. It has been only a week or 10 days since there was an effort to take all the public lands and put them in some sort of reserve for grazing purposes. That country will never grow until that land is opened up. Two-fifths of my State is in reserves. We want to build up the western country. No part of the country west of the Mississippi was built up except under the beneficent homestead laws that enabled the people to take up those lands.

This is a proceeding to abolish those offices and have the land surveyed from the city of Washington. As to the matter of expense, I dare say it will cost twice as much to have the surveying done from Washington. Take the records from the commissioner's last report, and he advised you that for the surveys made from Washington in all States where they have not surveyors general the cost was \$4 a mile square and where they had surveyors general it cost about \$2 a mile square to get the land surveyed. So I feel that an injustice is being done to my section of the country. I feel that there is a disposition to trespass upon it. I feel it is wrong to change the policy at this time, at least. It was not changed in Ohio, it was not changed in Iowa or in Nebraska, until the lands were surveyed. Why can not we follow the same procedure as was followed in those States?

Mr. EDMONDS. Did the gentleman think that an injustice was done when they took away the Subtreasuries of the East?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. If the gentleman asks me individually, I will say that I did not vote to take them away.

Mr. EDMONDS. Some of the gentlemen from your States did.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I relied on the statement of gentlemen who said that they were needed, and I voted to retain them. Will he rely on me now and vote with me to retain these surveyors general?

Mr. EDMONDS. I will.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I thank the gentleman, kindly. If we can get some more, we will win this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, no one doubts the good intentions of the members of the Appropriation Committee who brought in this bill or the members of the subcommittee who framed the bill. The trouble is they are dealing with a subject on which they have

little or no information, and in their effort to make a showing of economy they are doing a great injustice to all the public-land States of the Union and showing to the country and this House that they know little or nothing about the subject under consideration.

You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that while a Member who is leading the fight for this so-called economy was telling this House how the work of the surveyors general is now conducted and how it will be conducted when the State office is abolished and the records are all sent to Washington, and I asked if the map of survey of a given tract was made before the survey in the field or after the survey in the field, he insisted that the map was made before the actual survey on the ground. There are 2 men from public-land States on the Appropriation Committee and 30 more in this House, yet I am informed that the subcommittee who framed this provision did not consult a Member from a Western State where these offices are located. Any man living west of the Missouri River will tell you the absolute necessity for the continuance of these offices, and if he has lived there a year he will tell you that he wants home rule in the conduct of his local affairs and is utterly opposed to further concentration in Washington of the control of all governmental affairs that should be administered by local people for the benefit and convenience of the local people.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to see this bill cumbered by legislation that would make or retain unnecessary offices, but I do not believe the time has come when these offices should be abolished in these Western States. In Eastern States it was the custom to survey the land and settle the boundaries before the offices were abolished, and I can see no reason for changing the rule when there are only 12 States and 1 Territory left in which surveys have not been completed. The State of South Dakota, one district of which I represent, has approximately 30,000 acres of land that have not been surveyed. The homesteader has a right to be able to find that land when he files upon it and the Government says that he is entitled to it. He ought to be able to put his buildings and fences on it without unnecessary delay. At the present time there are 30 or 40 cases of surveys where lines are not run, and this will continue for approximately four or five years. At the expiration of that time I think the offices ought to be abolished, but there is no reason for taking the action while the offices are necessary. I think it would be false economy to transfer all these duties to the main office at Washington. A man who wants a survey run wants to be able to find the officer in his territory. And I oppose the feature of the bill which would make it necessary for a man to come to Washington in order to have that done which the Government ought to do for him without delay.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, there are other much more important matters connected with this proposition than the mere question of economy. Every Member from the West knows that if this change is made it will not save one dollar in expense to the Government. The work will have to be done by somebody. It will be done down here in Washington, the most expensive place on earth, where they have much shorter hours and very much higher pay and less efficiency. It will cost the Government more than it does to have the work done out in the field. It may not look that way now. But just wait until this work is all sent in and centered here. They will frantically insist upon having a thousand new clerks with expert skilled pay. But aside from that, even if there were some saving, which there will not be, there is no warrant or justification for this course. I feel that we ought to follow the policy that has been followed during the entire history of our country. Whenever the public lands of a State have all been surveyed and gone into private ownership, and no more work is to be done by the surveyor general, then, and not until then, is the office in that State abolished. Every State has had this office until all its surveys were made and completed and closed. Why change this policy now? And if there is any State in the Union now that has a surveyor general's office, with comparatively no public land left, this committee should abolish that particular office. This provision reported in this bill just wipes them all out by one fell swoop, without any attention whatever to the absolute necessity for them or to the work, that in many cases is far behind, and with no attention to the wishes or welfare of any of those States and without consultation with any of the Representatives in Congress of any of those States. The

welfare and development of our Western States should be the first consideration, and not the mere saving of a few dollars, even if it would save anything. This committee just shuts its eyes and wipes us all out. That action, if enacted into law, would cost the western people hundreds of thousands of dollars and untold delays, disappointments, and hardships that would be outrageous. That is not economy or justice. It is wholly wrong in principle and contrary to common sense and fair dealing. We do not want to send any more of our affairs to Washington to be attended to than is necessary. Washington is too far away from the people. The committee ought to consider how their action would affect each State.

Take the State of Colorado, that I have the honor in part to represent. We have at the present time 2,724,490 acres of unsurveyed land left in our State. I think we have a great deal more than that, because there are some 14,000,000 acres in its forest reserves, and I will bet there is scarcely a corner stone in all that 14,000,000 acres. Let me tell you that the number of acres published by the department as being unsurveyed does not mean that that is all the land that will have to be surveyed by any means. It probably means that no one has ever triangulated over that land. During this past year they have resurveyed in my State 279,000 acres. The fact about the so-called surveyed land is that many years ago some of these contracts were made to survey the land, and they reported their surveys and plats and their surveys were approved and plats duly filed here in Washington and in the local land office, but when the homesteader wants to locate a piece of ground he very seldom can find any corners. And when he hires a local county surveyor to find the corners and give him his numbers and he files, he then finds the surveys are not correct, and the whole country is withdrawn for a resurvey and is held up, and no entries allowed and no one can get a patent or know where he is for years and years while the Land Office is getting around in resurveying it, and until they can get all this land surveyed and then resurveyed and the lines correctly and definitely and finally settled they have no business to try to abolish the surveyors general.

In Rio Blanco and Routt and Moffat Counties, in my district, there the Government surveys were made about 1881 and 1882, and there was not a corner stone within 30 miles a few years ago. If they were ever set, there was not one left, and Congress had to appropriate \$50,000 to resurvey a large part of what is now two counties. There is a good deal of the early work where they put corner stones that are now all gone, and a large part of the so-called surveyed land in the State of Colorado will probably have to be resurveyed hereafter.

But, aside from that matter, aside from the ordinary survey of public lands which the Eastern States had, we of the mountainous West now have the mineral-land surveys, mining claims of all kinds, and those surveys will have to be conducted for a great many years yet. They are conducted by local United States deputy mineral surveyors who live out there; and if we had to have it done through supervision in Washington, and by correspondence between Washington and the field carried on, and the field notes checked up by correspondence in that way, it would involve a frightful expense and involve delay to the development of our country, and would be most awfully inconvenient and unsatisfactory. I do feel that the conveniences, welfare, and development of the West, after all, is of far greater consideration than this possible saving of \$48,000, and that is the most that they claim it would save. It does seem to me that this is a very shortsighted policy. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, under the leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I will insert a telegram that I received from the Hon. John B. McGauran, the United States surveyor general of Colorado, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., February 19, 1920.

Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

The discontinuance of surveys and resurveys of public lands and mining claims would be a great blow to the development of the West. This work must continue, and it is impossible from a practical standpoint to handle it from a central office in Washington. United States surveyors and deputy mineral surveyors must have records and instructions upon which field work is based readily accessible, to say nothing of the primary consideration of the convenience and necessity of records for use of local surveyors and the general public. Local offices for such purposes, and to be in close touch with field operations, are imperative. If the offices of surveyors general are abolished the Commissioner of

the General Land Office must necessarily establish local offices. This he has already done through supervisory offices, such offices usurping to some extent the lawful functions of the surveyor general, resulting in duplication of work and unnecessary expense. Why not seek to properly limit this attempt at enlargement of bureaucratic authority and retain to the surveyor general his statutory rights which have operated so successfully for half a century.

JOHN B. MCGAURAN,
Surveyor General.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment or substitute. I am in hope that the members of this committee, which is dealing with this question, will lift up their eyebrows and look across the Rocky Mountains. There are some men who can not see the Rocky Mountains much less see what is west of them.

The State that I have the honor in part to represent here is eight times as large as the State of Massachusetts, and in that State two-fifths of the area of the State is unsurveyed Government lands, and, furthermore, the State of Washington is inseparably hooked up with the present and future of the Territory of Alaska, a Territory of 577,000 square miles. What benefits Alaska not only benefits the State of Washington, but benefits every State in the Union.

There is not only great agriculture in the State which I have the honor in part to represent, but there are mineral lands of great value there. If there are any two things in the world we ought to try to encourage production of now, they are agricultural products and the products of the mines. Every day we see that the money in the Treasury of the United States, the gold held for the redemption of our circulating medium, is decreasing out of safe proportion, and under these circumstances why in the name of all that is good are we not paying some attention to increasing the development of the mines of the West?

This subject of the surveyors general of the States of the West is intimately associated with the mineral output and the agricultural output of the West. I am astonished that a policy in vogue is this country for a hundred years should now be sought to be abolished at this critical time in the history of our country, when we are trying to increase our production in the directions I have mentioned. I hope the House will vote to adopt the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. GRIGSBY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alaska is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GRIGSBY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have listened with interest to the statements of the Representatives from the Western States calling to the attention of the committee the number of millions of acres of unsurveyed land that they have in their respective States, and I must say that everything that they have said applies with a great deal more force to the Territory of Alaska, where we have over 300,000,000 acres of unsurveyed lands, and the most important office we have in that Territory, the office that is of most assistance to the people as homesteaders or miners seeking patents, is the office of the surveyor general.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIGSBY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that if this provision is adopted it will not take a single bit of the machinery away from Alaska or one of these States, so far as the surveys are concerned?

Mr. GRIGSBY. I understand from the reading of the bill that the entire machinery and all the clerical force will be removed.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. All the machinery for the surveys now provided will remain there as long as there is any seeming necessity for it.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIGSBY. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. Why should the gentleman from Indiana treat Alaska that way and not treat other States in that way? If there is surveying needed, why not leave the surveyors there?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It will not change the surveying in a single State.

Mr. GRIGSBY. Is there any difference in that regard between Alaska and the States?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No. The surveyor general shall remain the secretary of the Territory.

Mr. GRIGSBY. The provisions of the bill are that the entire clerical force shall be removed to Washington, and all the plats and records shall be removed from the offices.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GRIGSBY. I understand that the bill is mandatory in that respect. I did not hear that question raised before when any other gentleman was talking.

I have had an office across the hall from the surveyor general of Alaska for two years, and his is the busiest office conducted in Alaska.

We have over 500,000 square miles of unsurveyed land. The business is conducted with that office. Whenever a man wants to get a homestead, whenever he wants to get a patent for a mining claim, he has to do business with that office. Almost all the business we have to-day up there is done in connection with the bureaus down here in Washington, and we have to come down here enough as it is. Now, if I want to get a survey for a patent for a mining claim in Alaska, I have to employ a deputy mineral surveyor. They are scarcer than hen's teeth. I can find a surveyor or a civil engineer in Alaska, but he is not a deputy mineral surveyor. I can make an application to the surveyor general of Alaska and get him appointed, but under the terms of this bill I have got to come down here to Washington to have it done. He has to apply to the Commissioner of the Land Office, and the commissioner does not know him or his character or qualifications. The surveyor general in Alaska knows every surveyor in the Territory, and can pass on his qualifications. We can not do business in Alaska 6,000 miles away with a surveyor general's office conducted here in Washington, especially in the winter-time, when it takes from two to four months for the mail to make the round trip. We must have a surveyor general there on the ground [applause]; especially since the passage of the oil-leasing bill it is necessary that that office be maintained. What we want in Alaska is more government in Alaska and less in the bureaus in Washington. The forest reserves are already administered here; the fish and game are regulated here; everything is reserved from entry except mining and homestead land. If the office of the surveyor general is to be transferred to Washington, the governor of Alaska, the Federal judges, and court officials might as well be removed here, too, and there will no longer be any excuse for anybody living up there.

The surveyor general is ex officio secretary of the Territory of Alaska. This bill continues the salary of \$4,000 for the secretary of Alaska, but does not create such an office nor provide for filling it. A surveyor general is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; the bill contains no authority for the appointment of a secretary of the Territory. The surveyor general of Alaska is also a member of the Territorial canvassing board, which canvasses the returns of the elections for Delegate for Congress and the Territorial officers. If you abolish the office of surveyor general you will leave us without a canvassing board; possibly the committee thought that, inasmuch as Alaska elections are generally decided here in Congress, we do not need any [laughter]; but we do need a surveyor general, and need him on the ground. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska has expired.

Mr. GRIGSBY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for one minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH]. I oppose the provision striking out the positions of surveyors general. The State of Washington and the Territory of Alaska for a long time have been looked upon by Federal employees, including chiefs of bureaus and divisions here in the city of Washington, as desirable places to visit in the summer time. Do away with the State surveyors general but leave the clerks and field men, and you will find a continuous round of inspecting surveyors or traveling generals out there every summer to

join the array of Federal map makers, geologists, investigators, and so forth, already on our hands. You propose to save at the spigot and waste at the bung hole.

Mr. GANDY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MAYS].

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the first point I wish to make in this discussion is that these mineral surveys do not cost the Government of the United States any money. This seems to be a movement toward economy, but the surveys in our State have been paid for by miners, by the claim owners, and we have now to the credit of the office in the State of Utah over and above all expenses of that office the sum of \$13,948. These people who have this surveying done, who pay the bills, who put up the money, want to have the office there, so that their records may be there, and they are very anxious that this legislation should not be enacted. I read a paragraph from a letter just received from the Utah Chapter of the American Mining Congress:

UTAH CHAPTER,
AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS,
Salt Lake City, Utah, February 21, 1920.

HON. JAMES H. MAYS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MAYS: Since I wrote you this morning regarding the proposal to abolish the office of the surveyor general of Utah I have conferred with Mr. Thoresen, the surveyor general, and the conversation developed a fact that I overlooked in my telegram and previous letter to you.

It is that so far as the mineral work of this office is concerned in Utah it is more than self-sustaining, as the mineral-survey work is all paid for by claim owners. Mr. Thoresen advises me that there is a surplus balance of \$13,948 to the credit of the Salt Lake office at Washington to-day, this amount representing the profit of the Government from the mineral work in Utah after all expenses have been deducted. I also understand that several substantial balances, earned previously, have been absorbed into the National Treasury in former years.

I have not gone into the agricultural side of the question, as we do not assume to speak for the agricultural interests, and, as I understand it, agricultural surveys are made without cost to agricultural claimants. This is not the case with the mineral work, however, all of which is paid for by those who have the work done, and, as I have indicated, this activity shows an operating profit for the Government.

It seems to me that this is an additional and a potent argument, aside from the public necessity, for the continuance of this office here.

We sincerely trust you will succeed in retaining the office here.

Yours, very truly,

A. G. MACKENZIE, Secretary.

It has been stated here that the Commissioner of the General Land Office has recommended this change in the law. I do not believe that the Commissioner of the General Land Office intended to make any such recommendation. I want to read just a paragraph or two from the hearings on that particular point. In starting out on the subject of the surveyor general's office the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], chairman of the subcommittee, questioned the Commissioner of the General Land Office as follows:

OFFICES OF SURVEYORS GENERAL.

SALARIES, CONTINGENT EXPENSES, ETC.

Mr. WOOD. We will now take up the item, "Surveyors general." The appropriation you are asking under the first item, "For salaries of surveyors general, clerks in their offices, and contingent expenses" is \$11,220, as compared with \$11,100 last year. What is this additional \$120 for?

Mr. TALLMAN. The work in the offices of surveyors general varies in the different offices from time to time, and under the system of making these appropriations there are three times as many appropriation items as there are offices, and we have to adjust these appropriations to meet the number of employees and the salaries in each office from year to year. The total appropriation for the 13 offices of surveyors general is \$39,000 for their salaries, \$171,340 for their clerical assistance, and \$11,125 for their contingent expenses, amounting in all to \$221,465. To meet the necessities of the work we have readjusted some of those individual items of appropriation, the result of the whole of which, however, is \$2,405 less than the total for last year.

Mr. WOOD. How does the \$120 increase figure in that readjustment, Mr. Tallman?

Mr. TALLMAN. The first is Alaska—

Mr. WOOD (interposing). I do not mean how it is distributed among them. It is not only a readjustment, but you are increasing some place in order to take up this \$120. For what purpose is the \$120?

Mr. TALLMAN. In some cases we desire to promote some clerks a small amount, in other cases where the work has increased we desire to put on an extra clerk, in other cases the work has decreased and we can take off a clerk.

After pursuing an item of \$120 to its source and indicating a most penurious disposition toward the West, the gentleman from Indiana put to Mr. Tallman the question—

Can not you abolish these surveyors general and transfer these clerks here?

He replied—

Yes; that could be done.

This colloquy occurs in the hearings:

Mr. WOOD. How about the Montana office?

Mr. TALLMAN. Montana is a very large and very active public-land State. It is not advisable to consolidate offices of surveyors general. If there is any consolidation to be done they should be all consolidated and the work transferred to the Washington office.

Mr. WOOD. That would not hurt; all of these offices could be abolished without material detriment?
 Mr. TALLMAN. Of course, I do not belittle that work. They are doing important work, but the organization is not altogether in harmony with the development of the field organization and the office organization.

Of course a man is willing to augment his own importance. He is willing to have more clerks under him here. He is willing to take this responsibility, and they are now proposing to transfer these offices from all these States.

We have in Utah 20,000,000 acres of unsurveyed land, and I want to read just one little paragraph from the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, which was in the hands of this committee when they put this provision into the bill and to which they gave no heed.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Did the gentleman say 20,000,000 acres of unsurveyed land in the United States?

Mr. MAY. I said 20,000,000 acres of unsurveyed land in the State of Utah. The Commissioner of the General Land Office in his annual report says, with reference to the State of Utah—

In his annual report of operations in his district the surveyor general states that although the 20,000,000 acres of unsurveyed land in this State have been considered in the past unfit for agricultural purposes, much of it is now conceded to be adapted for dry farming and grazing purposes, and the present estimate is that more than one-half of the above amount can thus be used, and it is now being sought for by returned soldiers and sailors and other young men brought up on Utah farms. He is of the opinion that no work of more importance could be performed by the Government than having these lands surveyed as early as possible, so that this land would be brought under cultivation and made productive, and these citizens be thus engaged in useful pursuits and making permanent homes. As no entry can now be made prior to survey, the citizen hesitates to go upon and improve the public lands before making entry.

I read also a telegram from the Utah Chapter of the American Mining Congress and a telegram from the surveyor general:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, February 20, 1920.

Hon. JAMES H. MAY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Discontinuance of surveyors general office here and transfer of records would be a calamity to us, and we hope the proposal can be defeated. Official surveys of all mineral lands of the State are kept in that office, and without these records deputy mineral surveyors would have no data available on which to base their surveys of claims and nobody to check and approve their work. Functions of this office must be discharged somewhere and can not be done elsewhere with same efficiency and convenience as here. We are unable to understand why it is proposed to remove this office and these records from the place where they are used. As many as a hundred persons consult these records in a single day, and there are more than 6,000 surveys on file in this office. About 45 are filed monthly now. The coming season promises to bring more work into this office than for years past on account of improvement in metals, especially silver and lead. If it be found impossible to prevent removal, can you get in a provision requiring duplicates of these records to be filed with some Government or State officer here and kept up to date, so that our people may have access to them? It is unthinkable to require reference or a trip to another place as a preliminary to every mineral survey.

UTAH CHAPTER AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, February 26, 1920.

Congressman JAMES H. MAY,

Washington, D. C.:

Mineral division office self-supporting, with credit balance of \$13,000 at the agricultural division, through sales of surveyed lands. Net income over \$100,000 annually. Proof mailed Tuesday.

THORESEN.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT].

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment restoring the office of surveyor general offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], for the reason that I feel that the provision inserted in the bill by the committee abolishing this local office violates one of the cardinal principles of a democratic or a republican form of government, in that it takes the actual Government and the actual administration of the Government far away from the local people who are supposed to be benefited by its administration and execution.

Gentlemen talk about the economy of this change, a doubtful saving of less than \$50,000 per annum, to be made at the expense of the West, at the expense of expeditious administration. We are not even assured of this saving; it is a doubtful matter. By a change in our policy of administering and executing the mineral land laws this Government is going to receive from now on \$1,000,000 a year more than it has received in the past through the provisions of the mineral leasing law that we have just passed, the oil leasing, the coal leasing, and the phosphates law signed by the President Wednesday. We are going to get \$1,000,000 more into the Treasury each year from this source. Now, that law is going to entail from year to year more surveying. Those interested in that legislation and interested in the West should not be compelled to seek in Wash-

ington those who have charge of the administration of this law and the surveying of those lands.

What are the duties of the surveyor general? The surveyors are sent out by the surveyor general into the field during the summer. After the surveys are made the surveyors repair to the State capital, or wherever the local office is, where the map makers are. The map maker and the surveyor check up their maps and their field notes at the office in the State capital. If a mistake or ambiguity is discovered it can be corrected or cleared up at once; but if a mistake is discovered here in Washington it will not be corrected until the next year or the year after that, or whenever the local surveyor can be located. Under the present system if they find in the field notes a mistake in running a line the surveyor general immediately sends a surveyor back to the field to check up his lines, or to tie them up. It is impossible to go over this matter in the five minutes allotted me, but what is the situation in my State? We have in Oregon over 7,000,000 acres of unsurveyed land. How does that 7,000,000 acres compare with the area of some of the Eastern States? That 7,000,000 acres would make more than two States of the size of Connecticut. It would make seven States of the size of Delaware. It would make a larger State than Maryland, much larger than Massachusetts, much larger than New Hampshire, nearly 3,000,000 acres larger than New Jersey, more than ten times the size of Rhode Island, much larger than the State of Vermont. We should have an officer like the surveyor general in the State, as we have had for years, to order and superintend these surveys.

The embarrassment of this proposed change in the law is that the settler upon these lands seeking to have his lines run out would have to wait for the survey ordered from Washington. He would be compelled to seek relief 3,000 miles from the State, seeking it here in Washington. Possibly a surveyor and a map maker would be sent from Washington to the State of Oregon and then return here to check up the work here in Washington, whereas in the winter following the survey, where the office work is done locally, the entire matter can be straightened out at that time.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; I have but five minutes and the time is too short. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in seeking for economy, as they are trying to with this item in this bill, they have gone on the principle of "see a head and hit it," regardless of the effect on the 12 States involved and Alaska. They have reached out into the dark and surely have not given this matter due consideration from the western standpoint, from the standpoint of the people who are really looking for relief against the already too greatly overburdened and overhead Government that we have in Washington at the present time. I sincerely hope that every Member having the interest of the West and Alaska at heart will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho. [Applause.]

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, owing to the oil land, oil shale, coal, and gas there are hundreds of inquiries relating to this new legislation, known as the oil-land leasing bill. It is my hope that the surveyor general's offices will be continued as at present. Surely you will grant this small recognition to many really great Commonwealths whose honesty of purpose can not be questioned, who, knowing their own needs more than you can learn by letters, respectfully request that they be granted your trust and confidence in a vital form of handling these lands. Their whole life work is reclaiming arid lands, enduring extreme hardships, deprived of the many living comforts found here. It seems to them wrong to take away and center in Washington, directed by a bureau, the land records, but the greater point at issue is having those records at home. If located here, will require thousands of telegrams and tens of thousands of letters, requiring at least 30 days for reply, thus delaying business connected with lands. Imagine the expense of residents of Nevada, necessitating a continuous stream of our citizens to Washington upon land affairs. We are already overburdened with expense; we must have your confidence to leave the land records at home of easy access. We can not endure this additional load. This is not a question of retaining an officer within our State, but aiding the man whose hardships are already too great. You all realize what "at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior" means. It means concentration of those affairs in Washington. It means increasing appropriations every year. It means increasing Government bureaus. It means added expense, additional hardship, and delay to the pioneer, who deserves your consideration. [Applause.]

As it is, our State of Nevada is 89 per cent Government owned; there are more than 100,000 square miles of Govern-

ment-owned lands. It vitally affects our State; in fact, more than it affects any other State in the Union. I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho will be agreed to. [Applause.]

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen speaking on the bill may have unanimous consent to revise and extend their remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen speaking on the bill may have unanimous consent to revise and extend their remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. BURKE. Reserving the right to object, if it is confined to this section of the bill or to the amendment I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member on the floor of the House who is more interested in the economy program than I. It seems to me that at this time we are approaching a false economy program. Take my own State of Washington; we have in the public domain more than 8,000,000 acres of land, an area larger than the State of Connecticut and Delaware combined, an area larger than Massachusetts and Delaware combined. We have an area something like half the size of the State of Ohio or half the size of the State of Indiana.

Can anyone believe that it is going to be more economical or more satisfactory to do all the necessary work to be attended to by an office 3,000 miles away rather than that the surveyor general's office should remain in that State where prompt attention can be given to all necessary surveys?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Suppose it is demonstrated that none of the surveying instrumentalities and activities will be removed, but all of that will be kept there until there is no further use for it; would the gentleman then think it necessary to keep the surveyor general?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The bill definitely provides for all these things. The instruments, documents, and all furniture shall be transferred to the Commissioner of the General Land Office in this city.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. At the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior; but we have the word of the Secretary of the Interior that all the instrumentalities, so far as the surveys and records are concerned, will be kept there, so I can not conceive that anybody is going to be hurt.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It seems to me that centralizing of these forces 3,000 miles from the necessary field of action is not wise. If there is anybody that needs encouragement it is the poor homesteader endeavoring to make a home out of what has been left after 100 years of culling. He has not the time nor the money to put in in making investigations or waiting for the reports from the East. It would be similar to the situation that we have had in the War Risk Bureau, where there is great congestion and delay in reference to small problems.

The chairman contends that field men and all necessary records will be left in each public-land State; but let me read the bill:

SURVEYORS GENERAL.

After June 30, 1920, the offices of surveyors general in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, and the Territory of Alaska are discontinued, and the several surveyors general shall, on or before that date, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, deliver into the custody of the Commissioner of the General Land Office all field notes, maps, records, and other papers, and all furniture and equipment of their respective offices; and the commissioner is authorized, whenever the surveys and records of any surveying district are completed, to dispose of such field notes and plats of survey as are duplicates of records in his office in accordance with sections 2218 and 2221 of the Revised Statutes, and from and after June 30, 1920, the authority, powers, and duties in relation to the survey, resurvey, or subdivision of lands and all matters and things connected therewith, heretofore vested in and exercised by the several surveyors general, including the use in his office of deposits by individuals for office work, the like use of funds arising under the acts of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat., p. 937), and June 25, 1910 (36 Stat., p. 834), and the employment of personal services thereunder and for office work on Indian surveys, shall be vested in, and devolve upon, the Commissioner of the General Land Office: *Provided*, That so much of the clerical force in the offices of surveyors general as may be needed and such records as may be necessary may be transferred to the General Land Office in Washington, and the Joint Committee to Assign Space in Public Buildings shall provide the necessary additional space in the Interior Department Building.

For per diem in lieu of subsistence, salaries, freight and expressage on records, instruments and equipment shipped from the several offices,

and the purchase of additional stationery, supplies, and equipment required in the General Land Office by reason of such transfer, \$175,000, including \$4,000 for salary of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

Here I find that after June 30, 1920, the surveyor general's office of my State of Washington "is discontinued," and that on or before that date he "shall deliver into the custody of the Commissioner of the General Land Office all field notes, all maps, all records and other papers, and all furniture and equipment" of his office.

Under this language there can be no mistake as to the meaning and the intent of this provision. It abolishes the office of surveyor general, the field men, and all of the records so far as my State is concerned. It either discharges the men or it transfers them, bag and baggage, down to the city of Washington to become cogs in a great machine which is bound down with red tape, and which moves too slowly for the purposes and the convenience of my constituents.

There is a possible saving, on the face of the committee report, of \$48,000, but we know that frequently these presumed economies do not come out as they have been figured in advance, and it is very probable that instead of being an economy this will be an additional expense, with the additional delays and annoyances and all those things incident to having much of the work done and the records stored 3,000 miles from the locality where the lands are situated and the records are most needed.

I sincerely hope that every Member on the floor of the House, not only those from the States of the West but from all the States, will support the amendment that has been offered to this bill by the gentleman from Idaho. [Applause.]

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is little use, in the first instance, of this amendment. Section 2218, United States Revised Statutes, directs the Secretary of the Interior to complete the surveys as rapidly as they can be completed, and section 2219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States directs that when the surveys are completed on the unsurveyed lands in the several States all records, maps, and plats are to be turned over to the several States, and then the Commissioner of the General Land Office is given full power to administer and continue the law as to the surveys, and so forth, that the surveyor general now has.

Section 2221 provides that the State must first provide by proper legislation proper archives for the protection of the records.

So that if there was any necessity now for transferring these offices, if there was no work to be done at the present time, the Secretary of the Interior, under direct mandate of the law, would now direct the records to be transferred. Not having done so, it shows clearly that it ought not to be done. There are large tracts of unsurveyed public land in all these States running into the millions of acres in each State. In addition to doing the general work of surveying for the Government, everyone knows that the office of the surveyor general performs the additional function of making surveys, so that conflicting claims in respect to title can be settled. This proposition is to take the officer from the State and transfer him to Washington. To perform those duties some one would have to be sent from Washington at a very great traveling expense and at an annual salary unquestionably as large as the present salary of the surveyor general. In addition to that, it would cause considerable delay and a great deal of inconvenience and there would be no saving to the Government. The surveyor general keeps in close touch with the situation in the various States. In addition to the survey, he goes over it upon the ground to see that the records are properly made, that the returns are in proper form, so that the records may be as nearly correct as records of that kind can be. Instead of a man going right from the local office in the State, under this provision he is to be sent from the General Land Office at Washington, as I say, with a salary as large, if not larger, than the present surveyor general receives, and in addition to that at a large, enormous traveling expense. So that there is no economy in the amount of work to be done. There is enough work in all these public-land States, and there has not been a word to show to the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LONGWORTH). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I am of course delighted that there is no opposition apparent to the amendment, but if there is any opposition I think gentlemen in control of the time ought to yield to those who are opposed to the amendment instead of letting the time accumulate.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I was about to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], but he does not seem to be present.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, I think he concluded that the amendment is a proper one.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. WELLING].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt there to ask if the gentleman has anyone who is opposed to the amendment?

Mr. SISSON. No one has asked me for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, something was said in the early stages of this debate with reference to the elimination of these surveyors general offices because their functions had all been performed as in the older States. It must be borne in mind that in almost all of these Western States there is a great deal of unsurveyed land. In the State of Utah we have nineteen and one-half million acres of such land. Obviously it would be the poorest policy in the world to remove the agency for surveying that great quantity of land from the very locality where the land lies and bring it 3,000 miles away and establish a bureau here in Washington to transact that business. What is true of the State of Utah in connection with this matter is true of every other Western State. As a matter of fact, the survey of the public lands of those States is only fairly well begun, and it would be very poor policy when it comes to a question of economy to concentrate all of that work here in Washington, 3,000 miles away from the seat of activity.

I assert now that the Department of the Interior did not recommend the change. The individuals there who have had supervision and control of this matter did not recommend it. They expected that the offices would be continued as they had been in the past. It was upon the initiative of the Committee on Appropriations, a committee that confessedly knows absolutely nothing about the business in the office of surveyors general, that this is sought to be done. The members of the subcommittee have none of these offices in their particular States, but if they had wanted to obtain advice from some one on the Committee on Appropriations who did know something about the unsurveyed public lands they might have had that advice from the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. Apparently he was not called in or consulted with reference to the change that was made. Yet, going against the recommendations of the department, these gentlemen of the subcommittee have felt that in the interest of false economy an obligation rests upon them of coming here and asking for the disruption of this entire organization for the surveying of the public domain and the bringing of all its offices and officers and clerks here to Washington. In my judgment it violates every principle of democratic government, of distributing the functions of government among the people of the country. It closes up offices that have been established by the Government at great expense in Federal buildings and brings them here and multiplies the expense of administration here in Washington, whereas those offices are not costing the Government of the United States in the buildings where they are now located anything to-day. I sincerely trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho will be adopted and that the committee's provisions will be defeated.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELLING. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman referred to nineteen and one-half million acres of public land in the State of Utah. Would he be good enough to tell us the character of that land in the main, whether it is tillable or otherwise?

Mr. WELLING. It is public land, and probably a great percentage of it will be redeemed. Put water upon it, as will be done in the future, and it is the best land in the world. There are thousands of acres of oil land and mineral and coal land included in this area.

In my State applications for the survey of approximately 3,000,000 acres are now pending, all requested by the State of Utah and private citizens.

Applications for the survey of from 40 to 60 townships have been made annually during recent years, and only 20 to 30 townships have been surveyed. There is a great accumulation of demands for surveys not complied with.

Besides the above agricultural surveys, there have been 6,600 mineral surveys, embracing approximately 35,000 mining claims, completed, and 20 such surveys, embracing 93 locations, are now pending in the Salt Lake office, with an average filing of 45 applications for such surveys per month.

Relative to these surveys and the methods by which they can be secured, there are from 25 to 50 personal inquiries made daily at the Salt Lake office, besides numerous written requests for similar information. The United States mineral surveyors are constantly compelled to consult this office relative to the

initiation, execution, and completion of mineral surveys, and the same is true of the regular United States agricultural surveyors.

Therefore if this office work was to be transferred to Washington, it would incur very expensive hardships and long delays to both miners and agriculturalists, if it could be accomplished at all by correspondence with Washington. From experience it has been learned that many applicants for information are unable to define just what they require without extensive assistance from local officials. Hence it would be impossible for them to write to Washington for such information.

The delays in securing information, especially by surveyors in the field, would also be aggravating and expensive, as surveying crews would be prevented from proceeding with their work pending receipt of required information and instruction.

All surveys are made by instructions issued from the Salt Lake office, and during execution special detail instructions are often demanded and furnished the surveyors, which in many cases must be obtained before the work can proceed. If this information should be furnished from Washington it would cause much delay and expense in the execution of surveys. Agricultural surveyors are required to submit progress or advance returns of their work, which are checked in the local office and corrections or additions immediately ordered, if found necessary, while the surveying crews are on the ground. If these returns were to go to Washington, necessarily by mail, and such instructions returned to the men in the field, they would be miles away from the location in question; time would be lost and expense incurred in returning to complete the survey.

The applicants for surveys, especially mineral surveys, would be compelled to employ attorneys in Washington, through whom they could operate in securing necessary information, and so forth, regarding surveys required, which now is obtained by their personal application in the local office without expense.

I presume that it is not the intention of the committee to abandon entirely the making of surveys of the public domain, and therefore if the work should be continued in Utah with only a limited force of surveyors for agricultural lands, averaging for the past few years about six crews, they would necessarily have to maintain a supervisor of said field work and also a disbursing agent to pay their salaries and the expenses incurred by them, with necessary offices in Salt Lake City.

The extensive records and files in the Salt Lake office, both of agricultural and mineral surveys, from the beginning would necessarily have to be retained in some office there, and one or more qualified custodians would have to be maintained in charge of those records for the benefit of the public, and especially for the extensive mining industries of the State, as all basic information relative to titles of the vast amount of valuable real estate is confined, in many cases, exclusively in these records and files. The law provides that they shall be maintained there by the Interior Department until all the public lands of the State are surveyed and at such time deposited in the archives of the State.

Therefore, besides the salary and expenses of a disbursing agent, salaries of the custodians of the records and files would have to be paid by the department.

I feel certain that the experienced employees there, without exception, would rather leave the service than to be transferred to Washington; hence new and inexperienced persons would have to be employed to continue the work, under which circumstances the supervision and execution of the work would increase its cost far beyond the salary of the surveyor general that would thus be eliminated.

For these and numerous other reasons I deem it inadvisable and detrimental to the public welfare and more expensive to discontinue this work and transfer the same to Washington.

I am aware it is difficult to make our eastern representatives, whose lands have been surveyed long ago at the expense of the General Government and given them by merely residing thereon, to understand that the great West ought to receive equal rights, or any rights whatsoever; but it appears to me that they ought to know that money expended in the development of our national resources, even of the West, will redound to the general good of the entire country and, even beyond that, to the whole world. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make some remarks upon this bill, and I would like to have some gentlemen here aside from those who have been speaking on the other side, for I do not expect to be able to convince any of them. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. If the gentleman wanted to be entirely fair, why did he not ask for that when we started in on this debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred Members present, a quorum.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in the time I shall occupy in discussing this measure I am going to try at least to bring some information to the committee in reference to the manner in which the business will be conducted if the proposed proviso in the bill is adopted. I wish to say at the onset that the history of the surveyor general discloses that he is purely a political creation, and for the first half century of the Government we did not have any surveyors general at all. Some time after the establishment of general land offices, and it was determined that some political places were needed, some patriot conceived the idea of creating this office.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Wait until I can finish this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In 1823.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; it was before 1823. The surveyor general was created, as I say, purely as a political proposition, and he is yet a political reward, and, so far as the good of the service is concerned, he can be as easily dispensed with now as he was unnecessary at the time that he was created. Now, let us see the manner in which this work is conducted and see whether or not there is to be a saving of time, which is money, for, it is said, time that is saved is money earned. Now, let us see if we can save to the western people, those who are immediately interested, time or money or both. If the information which we have from the Department of the Interior is correct—and I do not think that anyone will say that the present Department of the Interior has any design or desire to undertake to cripple this work—as the plan now is if a survey is wanted the one desiring the survey has to first submit a plat to the surveyor general. The surveyor general, after a certain examination, takes and sends it to the city of Washington. Every one of these things have to come to the city of Washington for final approval. Now, if the surveyor general is wiped out there would be that time, at least, saved that the surveyors general has this plat or application under his examination and supervision before he sends it to Washington.

That is not all. If the operation as proposed by the Department of the Interior is correct, it will save time, because it will get immediate action at the time it is sent to the city of Washington and sent back to the one interested. Now, much has been said here about the great inconvenience that will result to the people of that country because of the fact that they will have to send to Washington to get a surveyor. The gentleman from Washington said—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; do not misquote me, but let me tell you what will happen: Just as it does in other great bureaus when they can, they will send specially favored men on a junket. See if it does not turn out that way.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The gentleman may be correct; but the information we have—and I think we have the right to rely upon it—we take and place responsible men at the head of these bureaus for the purpose of advising the Congress. Sometimes they may not give us the best possible advice, but I think it is the exception when they do not.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It certainly can not be said in my attempt of the abolishment of these offices that I have any partisan consideration in view, for the gentlemen asking for this thing to be done and who advise that it be done for the greater efficiency of the service are not of my political faith. So I can not be accused of that; but I do wish to submit to the Congress—to the Members upon that side as well as upon this side—that whenever we discover an opportunity to save money by the abolishment of useless offices, and especially when we do not interfere in any degree with the efficiency of the work that is to be performed, that it is the sworn duty of every man in this House to abolish such offices.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. MILLER. Who in the department has recommended the abolishment of these surveyors general?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If the gentleman would just content himself for a moment I will take pleasure in advising him.

Mr. MILLER. I have read the hearings.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I wish I had time to read all of the memoranda I have received from Mr. Tallman, under whose supervision this work finally comes. I wish I had time to read all of it, especially that part which details the manner in which the work is done now and all the steps that have to

be taken from start to finish before one of these surveys is finally completed. I will content myself, however, by reading the manner in which it will be done if this new scheme is adopted. He says:

As to the method by which this work would be handled in case of a transfer and consolidation of the work in the General Land Office at Washington, it may be stated first, that it will be necessary to maintain in each State, as at present, the field surveying organization with headquarters where necessary for the conduct of the work, presumably in the same offices, or a part thereof, now occupied by the surveyor general. The field surveyors, instead of submitting their field notes of surveys to the office of the surveyor general, would transmit same direct to Washington.

This shows that there will be a saving of time. It will save not only the time that is necessarily employed by the surveyor general in passing upon it, but it will save the additional time of passing upon whatever he may have to say concerning it by the General Land Office when the plat comes here.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. SINNOTT. Now, under this proposed change the field notes will be transmitted to Washington. Under the present system the field notes are sent to the State capitals and they are there taken up by the surveyor general.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Now, if the gentleman is going to ask a question—

Mr. SINNOTT. Now, just a moment.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Ask the question.

Mr. SINNOTT. I am—and the map maker goes over the matter with the surveyor and if a mistake is found in the field notes it is corrected there at once without any delay, but under this system that the gentleman proposes the field notes are sent to Washington and if a mistake is found the surveyor general—

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I absolutely refuse to yield further. The gentleman rose to ask a question and he has asked no question.

Mr. SINNOTT. The question will be on the end of my statement. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The trouble is there is no end to the statement.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not yield further.

Mr. SINNOTT. I want to make the interrogation point.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield for a question? I want to get some light on it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Do I understand the gentleman from Indiana to say that under the system that is now in vogue no survey can be made even by the direction of the surveyor general until after he has been instructed from Washington?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, instead of sending the application, then, through the surveyor general, there is a survey, if the committee recommendation is adopted, and people send the application direct to Washington, and an answer will go directly back, and save time and money perhaps?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is correct. I will read further from the statement of Mr. Tallman.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will not. I will read. Now, listen:

Instructions for surveys would likewise be prepared in the Washington office and sent to the field surveying organization direct—

Now, listen. There has been much talk here about the removal of the field notes. I want to put that forever at rest, showing again how time will be saved by eliminating the surveyors general:

There would be no necessity of moving the official field notes and plats now kept in offices of surveyors general from their present location. It will be desirable to keep them where they are for reference by the field surveying service, in which case they could also be made available to the public as they are now, and such files would very properly be kept up to date, with additions of transcripts of field notes and plats of future surveys. Mineral surveys would be appointed by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, instead of his approval of their appointment by the surveyor general, as now. Applications for mineral surveys would be made direct to the Washington office, and the order for the survey issued to the proper deputy who, in turn, would make return of his survey direct to the Washington office.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. FRENCH. I want to call attention to the mineral surveys. When they are initiated they are not referred to the Washington office, but upon application and deposit of fee by the applicant the surveyor general directs the survey. Numerically they are greater than all other surveys.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That may be true. I will read further:

The instructions for surveys, instead of being prepared in the office of the surveyor general and submitted to Washington for approval, would be prepared and approved in Washington and sent out to the surveyor.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Do you understand from the commissioner's statement that a surveyor or engineer here in Washington, who knows nothing about local conditions, could prepare instructions and submit them to a surveyor out there as well as a surveyor in the surveyor general's office could?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The plat has to come here in the first instance, and the plat has to contain all the preliminaries, and a surveyor could do it here as well as at any other place. These gentlemen are desirous of keeping this one officer, who is just as useless as it is possible for a man to be useless and whose removal will not in the least cripple this work. I presume it has always been so. Kansas has had them, Nebraska has had them, and all of the Western States have had them, and yet they were finally removed, and I dare say there were gentlemen here contending, as gentlemen are contending to-day, for the absolute necessity of continuing them. And the time will never come when a Representative from one of these States will be here to advocate their abolishment.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I would like to ask the gentleman if the plat is sent here after the survey is made or before the survey is made?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. After the preliminary survey is made.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. The plat is the evidence of the survey?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The plat is the evidence of the preliminary survey that is now submitted to the surveyor general.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. There is no plat of preliminary survey. The surveyor takes his field notes after going over the field and makes his plat and sends it for approval to Washington.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The notes are originally taken and sent to the surveyor general and from him to Washington, and there can not be any action taken in any individual case until final approval is had by the General Land Office. The gentleman need not try to delude other Members, because they know that the Commissioner of the General Land Office is the last man to pass on it and give his approval to the proposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is not all that red tape and rignmarole one of the reasons we are getting along so poorly in this matter, particularly in Alaska?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think that is true. I believe that you can get along much faster by discharging than by keeping these useless officers.

I will read further:

In case of public-land township surveys, when the field notes and plats are found to be in satisfactory condition, they will be approved and accepted by the same operation, instead of being first approved by the surveyor general, then examined, and accepted by the General Land Office and the plats returned to the surveyor general.

The field surveying organization would have to maintain its own disbursing officers and financial clerks to keep their accounts, which would probably be concentrated in the one office of the supervisor of surveys at Denver.

Consolidation of the offices of surveyors general in one office would undoubtedly result in a saving of overhead expenses and also in the development of a single standard of efficiency for the entire force. The only disadvantage that occurs to me which might result from the proposed change would be the removal of the more localized source of information for the public, principally in the case of mineral surveys within the State, and, as above stated, it is thought that the matter can be handled in such a way as to obviate, if not eliminate, this disadvantage. It will be noted that the existing law and also a provision of the pending legislative bill provides that the official field notes and plats of the offices of surveyors general shall be turned over to the States when the surveying work in such States is completed. This has already been done in the older public-land States.

It is under a law that is now established, so that the train of box cars which the gentleman says would be necessary to take and remove the records of these offices would never be called into use, because those records never would be removed. The only purpose of this proviso is to eliminate this useless office of surveyor general; just as useless, if you please, as the Subtreasuries of the United States were, and we removed them.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Under this bill the records are to be transferred to the custody of the Commissioner of the General Land Office here in Washington, and pending that and before they are turned over to the States how are you to get a certified copy of these records if they are out in the State of California? He has to send a deputy out there to do that.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No. That is a mere small matter of detail. There will be no trouble in regulating that.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. If they are never to be transferred to Washington, why is this appropriation of \$175,000 proposed?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It would be because the clerical force, being under the supervision of the surveyor general, would be under the supervision of the department here in Washington. We are appropriating \$172,000 now to pay for this clerical force. That money is now disbursed by the surveyor general. The only difference would be that it would be disbursed by the home office if this new proposal is adopted.

Mr. MAYS. Is the gentleman informed whether the Commissioner of the General Land Office has spare office space for all these clerks?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There would be no occasion for any great amount of office space. These clerks very largely, as I have tried to impress upon you gentlemen, will remain where they are, doing the work that you say is essential for them to do, and we would save the time now uselessly wasted in sifting the thing through the surveyor general.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand the gentleman to say that it is not proposed to transfer the clerks from their present local offices to Washington?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Only such clerks as may be necessary to carry out the administrative part of it at this end instead of at that end.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman propose to keep the clerks still there?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. All the force necessary to complete the surveys, as is now done.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it part of the gentleman's plan to divide this force and still have a force, but without a head, in all these localities, and then transfer part of them here? Is that the plan?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is not the plan, and nobody has said that it is the plan to divide the force.

Mr. MONDELL. Has not the gentleman stated that it is the intention to retain some of the clerks there?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have repeatedly said—and I hope the gentleman will not misunderstand me—that, so far as the working of the service under this plan is concerned, it will not be crippled in the least.

Mr. MONDELL. I was not raising the question whether it would cripple the work or not, but I was trying to get an idea as to the modus operandi. I supposed the gentleman was proposing the closing of the surveyors general offices and transferring all the work to Washington. Now I get the idea from the gentleman that what he proposes to do is to send a certain number of clerks here, and to retain a certain number without any head in the field. I was wondering how that could be done.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The way it is now, as Mr. Tallman said in his testimony before the committee, which I included in my general remarks upon this bill, is that they are all officers and no privates. That is the trouble about the business. There is not that cooperation that is requisite to efficiency, and because of that condition, in the opinion of the Department of the Interior, the work can be better directed from this central office, and we therefore propose this change.

I wish to state, further, that your committee, in order that we might know if this work could not be best done by consolidating some of these offices in the West, so as to dispense with some of them, made inquiry, and Mr. Tallman said that would not cure the evil at all, but that when one was abolished they ought all to be abolished, so that they would all be under one central control, and that should be in the parent office here in Washington.

Mr. RAKER. As I understand the gentleman, the records and the office force and all would remain in their present location. Is that correct? I understood from the gentleman's statement, quoting the commissioner, that the force as it now exists, together with the plats and records, will remain where it is in the various States, for the convenience of the people and for the efficiency of the work. Is not that correct?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. But the commissioner does add this, that he will have a man in charge to take care of them?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Absolutely.

Mr. RAKER. That being the case, I want to be frank with the gentleman and ask him this question: While the man in charge will not be called "the surveyor general," yet he will

cost more than the surveyor general costs now and not give as good results, will he not?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; he will not, because the work now for the most part is purely supervisory, and it will be none the less supervisory then. We are trying to get rid of a useless officer, not that anyone is trying to cripple this work out there. It was certainly not the intention of the Department of the Interior to cripple it. They have advised us that the work will be more efficiently done and result in the saving of time and in the saving of some expense to the very men who are most interested in it.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman explain this: As I understand, the chairman says there will be field notes and records left there for the convenience of the people of the States. Is that right?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Then it says here that all field notes, all maps and records, and all other papers and all furniture and equipment of the respective offices shall come to the General Land Office.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is in the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I fail to find that. I find that "so much of the clerical force in the offices of the surveyors general as may be needed and such records as may be necessary shall be transferred to the General Land Office at Washington." It does not say anything about leaving any behind. I can not quite understand that word "all."

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. This whole business, as I take it, will have to be left in the discretion of the General Land Office, which is primarily interested in this work and of necessity must be charged with its responsibility. Now, I have no interest in the western land offices. I dare say if there was one in Indiana I would be here, like these other gentlemen are here, trying to point out some reason why it should be retained. That is inseparable from human nature, and, as I said before, the time will never come when there is a single individual who will be willing to admit that his land office or surveyor general should be abolished.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. If one-third of the State of Indiana was still unsurveyed, as one-third of my State is, and one-third of other States unsurveyed, the gentleman ought to be opposed to its abolishment.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. As against that proposition I submit the statement coming from a source that is absolutely disinterested and impartial, from an official who, if he had any leaning at all, would have a leaning toward the work being done out there; but he tells us that the work you are talking about, the surveying of the land, can be more expeditiously done and more economically done, resulting in the saving of time and expense, under direction from the home office rather than by local supervision.

I would not be here advocating the abolition of these offices if I was not convinced that the Department of the Interior, which is charged with this responsibility, knows what it is talking about. I do not believe that department would advise the Congress or any committee of Congress to do either a foolish thing or an unreasonable thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Has all time on this side expired?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There were three minutes yielded back, and I have not used that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from Indiana was given credit for the three minutes. The gentleman from Mississippi has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. Sisson. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to talk on this subject, and I certainly do not desire to discourage the intention of the committee to economize. If I thought there was the slightest possibility of economizing under this legislation I would welcome it and vote for it; but in my opinion it would increase the cost and delay the execution of the surveys in a way that would be very harmful.

Our first surveyor general was appointed in 1823 for Florida, and since that time every public-land State, one after the other, has had its surveyor general, who has served until the surveys were completed, until the land was settled, and then the office was closed and abolished. It was so in Kansas, in Nebraska, and in Iowa, and so eventually it will be in all of the States. But until recently nobody has had the idea that you could properly dispense with the office that has to do with the surveys until the surveys were executed. What is the modus operandi? The surveyor general sends surveying parties into the field. They execute their surveys, and in the fall they bring their field notes into the office of the surveyor general, where they are written up and where the plats are made. At the time the plats are being made by the skilled drafting mapmakers of the surveyor general's office, the man who made the survey is frequently there to answer any questions that may arise as to any obscure matter in the field notes. After the plat is made, if there is anything faulty requiring a return to the field, they are within a day's travel or mail dispatch of the man who did the surveying, and he can return to the field and make the correction. Now, imagine that instead of having that facility everything had to await the sending of the field notes to Washington and the return to the field every time there was any correction under or any uncertainty or obscurity in the field notes, the distance to be covered being 1,500 or 2,500 miles each way, when it was found that a return to the field was necessary.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I have only five minutes, and I have quite a bit to say. More than that, these trained draftsmen out in the States are getting an average of \$1,600 a year. The same class of skilled employees here are paid \$2,000 or more, and quite likely these same people by promotion would be paid that within a year after they arrived at Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Or else they would not stay here.

Mr. MONDELL. Being scattered out through the States, their salaries are lower than they are here, because there is nobody constantly urging an increase.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. In answering a question which I propounded to the chairman of the committee he said—I think he is in error—that the map was made before the survey was made. Will the gentleman tell us about that?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, the gentleman did not intend to say that. There is no map until the surveyor, at the order of the surveyor general, has gone into the field and made the survey and come back with his notes indicating directions, distances, and topography. From those notes the men and women skilled in transferring to the plats the information contained in the field notes do the work in the surveyor general's office, and the office here has little to do except the largely formal function of approving after it is all completed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 79, noes 39.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers. Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. Wood of Indiana and Mr. FRENCH to act as tellers.

The committee proceeded to divide.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. I want to know whether this is pork or economy. I notice the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is voting for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 82, noes 50.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURKE. A request was made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] that all gentlemen who spoke upon the amendment should have the right to extend their remarks in the Record. I notice the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] butted in. Will he have the right to extend his remarks? That is what I want to know.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not advised as to the parliamentary definition of the phrase "butted in" and is, therefore, unable to answer the gentleman's question. The gentleman from Texas was recognized by the Chair to speak upon the amendment, and the Chair assumes that he would have the right to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.
Mr. MANN of Illinois. Was permission given in response to that request?

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair was not in the chair at that time and he is unable to answer that question.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It has been held time and again that the committee has no power to give such permission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union has not the power to give such consent as the Chair is informed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE] it did give, but the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair at the time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Chair the parliamentary situation was this: The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] submitted a request for unanimous consent that all members of the committee who spoke upon the pending amendment should have the privilege to revise and extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. Sisson. Confined to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair would have held that that request was not in order in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No objection was made on that ground.

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair was not present at the time.

Mr. BURKE. But the Chair was present when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] interrupted the gentleman from Mississippi—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, to relieve the situation I will state to the gentleman that I have no intention of extending any remarks in the Record. That will relieve the gentleman's mind.

Mr. BURKE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For per diem in lieu of subsistence, salaries, freight and expressage on records, instruments and equipment shipped from the several offices, and the purchase of additional stationery, supplies, and equipment required in the General Land Office by reason of such transfer, \$175,000, including \$4,000 for salary of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the paragraph is not authorized by law and therefore—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair ruled on the main proposition and overruled the point of order, and the Chair for the same reason will overrule this point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph because clearly it provides for the transfer—

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, page 114, all of line 19 up to and including line 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 114, line 19, strike out all of lines 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, inclusive.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES.

Territory of Alaska: Governor, \$7,000; four judges, at \$7,500 each; four attorneys, at \$5,000 each; four marshals, at \$4,000 each; four clerks, at \$3,500 each; in all, \$87,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out of line 5 the sum of "\$87,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 115, line 5, strike out the figures "\$87,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, much has been said here about retrenchment and economy. I do not know what is in the mind of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE], who seems to be much afraid that I may say something on railroads or extend my remarks in the Record. If he is present, he is going to hear something from me—

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I am in favor of economy and striking out these big amounts of money. Mr. Chairman, am I recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask the Chair kindly not to take this interruption out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania make the point of order?

Mr. BURKE. That the gentleman is not speaking to the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I think I know the rule, and I will confine myself to the rule. The Chair will not take this from my time. I am seeking to strike out these unnecessary sums of money from this bill. Now, in this bill are unnecessary sums. I want to ask the chairman of this committee if he knows exactly how many messengers he is providing for in this bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will say offhand I can not tell.

Mr. BLANTON. Approximately, if the gentleman knows?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The report will disclose exactly.

Mr. BLANTON. I can tell the chairman exactly how many are provided for. You provide for 1,076 messengers, and I can tell you exactly how many watchmen are provided for, and I am sure the gentleman does not know that. He is providing for 515 watchmen, and this does not include the guards, of whom there are several hundred provided for in this bill. Now, on the Agricultural bill the other day, that distinguished committee of economy provided for 754 messengers for the Department of Agriculture, and they provided for 76 watchmen for the Secretary's office, so stipulated in the bill, and now this great committee of economy goes them one better and runs its number up to 1,076 messengers. That is why all of this so-called economy of theirs is "lip economy," as I have said before. That is why, when it comes to appropriating an additional \$35,000 in one item for feeding the elk out in Wyoming, you find the distinguished gentleman, the leader of the other side of the House, takes the floor and brings his fellows in here to keep that money in there, because it is spent in Wyoming, and that is why, even after the gentleman from Wyoming went to this committee and, insisting on economy, told them that he would stand by them, as stated by Mr. Sisson, and when the committee, acting on his advice and suggestion, attempts to cut out of this bill unnecessary offices and asks that the promise of the gentleman from Wyoming that he would stand by them be carried out you find the gentleman from Wyoming taking the floor and defeating the committee's action, under rather peculiar circumstances it is true, because I happened to be over here when he came to the chairman of the committee, and he said, "Mr. Chairman, I want some time"; and the chairman said, "You will not get any time here to speak against the bill"; and he had to go to the other side of the House to get it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman is not speaking to his amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. The distinguished ex-United States Senator from Illinois ought to know that even in the other end of the Capitol there is at least some latitude allowed in debate.

Mr. MASON. I ask a ruling by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Texas will confine himself to the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I will now get back to it. I moved to strike out the sum of \$87,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman that that is an appropriation for the Territory of Alaska. The gentleman will confine himself to Alaska.

Mr. BLANTON. May I not enlarge upon the subject of economy—striking out money from this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. If any gentleman makes the point of order, the Chair is bound to sustain it, because the gentleman is not discussing the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair hear me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the precedent established in this House some years ago when a very distinguished gentleman moved to strike out the last word, which happened to be "dollar," from an appropriation bill. The precedent was then established that upon the motion to strike out the last word, which was "dollar," even made as a pro forma motion, the Chair held that he could discuss the subject of an American dollar and everything that it embraced. I moved here, if the distinguished Chairman will recollect, to strike out the sum of \$87,000 from this bill. In the latitude that is usually allowed in debate—that is, which used to be allowed—when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] was a Member of the United States Senate, I ought to be permitted to show why it is necessary to strike such sum of money from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The paragraph to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] makes the point of order is a paragraph providing for the salaries of the governor, judges, and attorneys in Alaska. The gentleman is discussing the messenger service in Washington. The Chair

sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois, and informs the gentleman from Texas that his time has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I will reserve my further remarks until the subject of messengers is reached.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 115, line 2, to insert a semicolon after the figures "\$7,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Page 115, line 2, after the figures "\$7,000" insert a semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will make the correction. The Chair overlooked putting the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw it. It was a pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

For incidental and contingent expenses, clerk hire, not to exceed \$2,500; janitor service for the governor's offices and the executive mansion, not to exceed \$1,200; traveling expenses of the governor while absent from the capital on official business; repair and preservation of executive mansion and furniture and for care of grounds, stationery, lights, water, and fuel, in all, \$7,500, to be expended under the direction of the governor.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question. What is the salary of the members of the legislature in Alaska?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The salary of the members of the legislature are paid out of the Territorial treasury, and they are paid a per diem, I think, of \$15.

Mr. McARTHUR. How much mileage?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That comes later. The salaries of members amount to \$21,600; and the mileage is \$9,250.

Mr. McARTHUR. That is in here; but what I wanted to get at was the per diem.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is \$15 per day, and the traveling expense is 15 cents a mile, I think.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Office, Postmaster General: Postmaster General, \$12,000; chief clerk, including \$500 as superintendent of buildings, \$4,000; private secretary, \$2,500; disbursing clerk, \$2,250; appointment clerk, assistant to chief clerk, confidential clerk to Postmaster General, and chairman, board of inspection, at \$2,000 each; chief inspector, \$4,000; chief clerk to chief inspector, \$2,000; purchasing agent, \$4,000; chief clerk to purchasing agent, \$2,000; assistant attorneys—1 \$3,500, 2 at \$2,750 each, 1 \$2,500, 1 \$2,000; bond examiner, \$2,500; law clerk, \$1,800; clerks—116 of class 4, 170 of class 3, 268 of class 2, 297 of class 1, 138 at \$1,000 each, 26 at \$900 each; skilled draftsmen—1 \$2,000, 3 at \$1,800 each, 8 at \$1,600 each, 5 at \$1,400 each, 7 at \$1,200 each; map mounter, \$1,200; assistant map mounter, \$1,000; blue printer, \$900; assistant blue printer, \$840; telegrapher, \$1,400; typewriter repairer, \$1,200; 3 telephone switchboard operators; 6 messengers in charge of mails, at \$900 each; 30 messengers; 20 assistant messengers; captain of the watch, \$1,200; additional to 3 watchmen acting as lieutenants of watchmen, at \$120 each; 34 watchmen; 2 engineers, at \$1,200 each; 9 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; 2 blacksmiths or steam fitters, at \$1,000 each; 3 oilers, at \$840 each; 16 firemen; 20 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; chief engineer, \$1,600; assistant electricians—2 at \$1,200 each, 3 at \$1,000 each; 2 dynamo tenders, at \$900 each; carpenters—1 \$1,600, 1 \$1,200, 2 at \$1,000 each; plasterer and mason, \$1,200; awning maker, \$1,000; painters—1 \$1,200, 1 \$1,000; plumbers—1 \$1,200, 1 \$1,000; laborers—foreman \$900, assistant foreman \$840, 2 at \$840 each, 78 at \$720 each, 4 at \$660 each; female laborers—1 \$540, 3 at \$500 each, 7 at \$480 each; 53 charwomen; actual and necessary expenses of the purchasing agent while traveling on business of the department, \$500; in all, \$1,691,770.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, economy, after all, means self-denial. Nobody can economize in private life without denying himself something that he might want if he did not have to economize. Retrenchment means, after all, cutting off and drawing in and cutting down expenses. Every time we attempt to cut off an appropriation in this House we are going up against the will and the wish of some one. We might as well make up our minds to that. We are going directly against the will and wish of somebody. There is somebody who does not want us to do it. We can not retrench here unless we make somebody mad. We can not cut off these big expenditures unless we will go up against some of our best friends in this House.

Every time an attempt is made to economize here the word is passed around, "This colleague of ours wants this; he is a good fellow; let us help him out; we must not go against him"; or "The West wants this done, and we must help them out"; and the word passes around, and enough fellows will be brought in to stand up by him, because he is our colleague. Every time we vote to cut down an appropriation we are voting against somebody's pet scheme to spend money in a district.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, because I know he believes in economy.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] informed us that the members of the Legislature of Alaska—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I can not yield for that. I thought the gentleman was going to talk about economy. I am on the live subject of economy now. I want to say that 1,076 messengers, contained in this bill, are entirely too many messengers. You know that as well as I do. I want to say that 515 watchmen in this bill are entirely too many watchmen, and you know that, too, as well as I do.

Take the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the distinguished leader of the majority party. Do you not know that if he wants to keep any matter from passing he can do it? All on earth he has to do is to get my friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] to go to the telephone and ring up "the boys" and they will obey. They will be in their seats here and they will carry out his wish. If he wanted to economize, he could do it. If my good friend from Wyoming had wanted to stand by his promise made to this committee, that he would economize and stand behind that committee's acts of economy, he could have gotten in enough fellows a little while ago to have defeated that amendment which put back into this bill the surveyor general out in the West. He did not want to defeat it. I want to say that there are several million acres of land out in Wyoming yet unsurveyed and he does not want that service withdrawn out in the West, as the employees spend money there.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I can not yield. I have not the time. I would yield if I had the time.

I want to tell my friends why my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE] was so stirred up a while ago for fear I would extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman from Texas is not speaking to his amendment, which is pending before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair indicate what particular part of my argument was not pertinent to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment which the gentleman offered was to strike out the paragraph, and that paragraph refers to the pay of the employees under the Postmaster General. The gentleman will confine himself to that subject.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair indicate what part of my argument was out of order? I want to find out, so that I can keep in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Everything outside of the discussion of the employees under the Postmaster General's department.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair rule that way when I say there are 1,076 messengers included in this bill and quite a number in this paragraph? Outside of this paragraph, we carry more than a thousand. I was undertaking to show that they were not necessary in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's argument must be confined to the provisions of the paragraph which he moved to strike out.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand the Chair. Now, if the Chair will kindly not take this out of my time [laughter], I will ask how many of you are going to begin to economize over here? You have got to make a beginning some time. The people of the United States demand it. They are going to require it. I want to tell you something. This applies to both sides of the House—to my side as well as yours. If we do not begin to economize, possibly it will be our last chance. Perhaps next year there will be somebody here in our places who can economize for the people, when the new Congress comes in. Are you going to wait until the election? I want to tell you right now, my good colleagues, that the people of this country are stirred up on this question of economy and of proper reconstruction and getting back to normal conditions. You had better do what they want done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. BLANTON. Why, Mr. Chairman, outside of interruptions and points of order I have not had much more than a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. BURKE. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment. I see there is no use to make any attempt to economize; there seems to be no chance in this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw the pro forma amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking a question. For what purpose do they use the 34 watchmen provided in this paragraph? Do they need that many?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There are three buildings occupied by the Post Office Department, and they need a certain number of watchmen there in the daytime, but most of them are employed there at night. There is a great amount of very valuable property which belongs to the Post Office Department and a great amount of valuable property going through the mails, and it is necessary to have watchmen to safeguard this property. If we could get along with proportionately as few watchmen in the other departments of the Government as we have in the Post Office Department, where it occurs to me there is very great necessity for them, we would be very well satisfied.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Are there any more employed under this item than are needed?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not think so.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Are these watchmen selected through the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They are.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For miscellaneous expenditures, including telegraphing, fuel, lights, foreign postage, labor, repairs of buildings, care of grounds, books of reference, periodicals, typewriters and adding machines and exchange of same, street car fares not exceeding \$200, and other necessities, directly ordered by the Attorney General, \$35,000.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. Out of what fund are the operatives in the Department of Justice paid who are scattered throughout the country?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They are paid out of the fund known as the fund for the detection and prosecution of criminals, which fund is provided in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. MILLER. Who has the fixing of the salaries of these men?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The Attorney General.

Mr. MILLER. He has arbitrary power as to the number and the amounts that he pays?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is a part of the Secret Service. The Subcommittee on the legislative bill make no appropriation for it and have no information on it.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman give any idea what is the amount of the appropriation that is made?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Some gentleman on the subcommittee having in charge the preparation of the sundry civil appropriation bill can tell that.

Mr. MILLER. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Solicitor of the Department of Labor: Solicitor, \$5,000; law clerk, \$2,000; clerks—two of class 4, two of class 1; messenger; in all, \$13,840.

Mr. Sisson. Is the gentleman willing to rise now?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12610, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD presented a conference report on the bill (H. R. 12046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand the Chair has ruled that the time to reserve points of order on a conference report is after the report has been read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has so decided, and the gentleman was present.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

On February 26, 1920:

H. R. 8819. An act to amend the Army appropriation act for 1920, and for the purchase of land and to provide for construction work at certain military posts, and for other purposes.

On February 27, 1920:

H. R. 12351. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River in Halifax County, N. C.

H. R. 6863. An act to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 28, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HUSTED, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12724) to declare Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 682), which said bill and report were referred to the House calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12787) providing for the recording of mortgages on vessels and notation thereof on certificates of registry or enrollment and license; creating jurisdiction in the district courts of the United States for the foreclosure of mortgages so recorded and noted, and providing procedure in connection therewith; also providing for maritime liens upon vessels for necessities, etc., and their enforcement, and subordinating the same to the liens of mortgages; repealing all conflicting acts; and for other such purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 12788) authorizing any tribes or bands of Indians of California to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 12789) to enlarge the United States post office, Ardmore, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 12790) to incorporate the Supreme Tabernacle, Illustrious Order Knights of the Cross; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 12791) to amend section 15 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12792) authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Olympic National Forest, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 12793) making an appropriation for the contribution of the United States toward an international conference of agriculture; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRIGSBY: A bill (H. R. 12794) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Anchorage, Alaska, two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 12795) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare plans and specifications for

the public building in the Borough of the Bronx, New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 12796) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to remodel and repair the present post-office and subtreasury building and the appraisers' stores building at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 12797) to amend an amendment to an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 12798) granting a pension to A. W. Dumm; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12799) granting an increase of pension to Carl F. Gatterdam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 12800) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius D. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12801) granting an increase of pension to Donald A. Nicholson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12802) granting a pension to Frazier Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12803) for the relief of John Clark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 12804) granting a pension to Charles Cranmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 12805) to authorize the commissioning of Dr. Hugh Hamilton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12806) for the relief of Peter Swartz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12807) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 12808) granting a pension to Catherine Golden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12809) granting an increase of pension to Aaron C. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 12810) granting an increase of pension to William Middagh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12811) granting a pension to Huston Frey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12812) granting a pension to Holman B. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12813) granting a pension to Samuel Walls; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12814) granting a pension to John H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 12815) granting a pension to Jane Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1904. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the city council of the city of Portland, Oreg., indorsing the action of the American Association of State Highway Officials, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1905. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of the Wallace S. Chute Post, No. 76, of the American Legion, opposed to the proposed bonus for the soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1906. By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of 16 citizens of California, protesting against the sale by the United States Shipping Board of former German ships seized by the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1907. Also, petition of the members of the Wesley Methodist Episcopal Church of Richmond, Calif., favoring independence for Armenia, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1908. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Rockford and Streator, Ill., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1909. Also, petition of the Boone Post of the American Legion, of Belvidere, Ill., relative to compensation for the widows and orphans of the late war, also the disabled and their dependents, etc.; to the Committee on Way and Means.

1910. Also, petition of the local union of the International Hod Carriers and Building and Common Laborers' Union of America against the Sterling-Graham bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1911. Also, petition of the Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association of America, favoring an increase in salary for the personnel of the Steamboat-Inspection Service, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1912. By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Petition of G. L. Edwards and 27 others, of Cumberland, Iowa, against compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1913. By Mr. HERSMAN: Petition of City Council of San Jose, Calif., protesting against the sale of the former German merchant fleet; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1914. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Amory, Browne & Co.; Parsons Trading Co.; P. Pastene & Co.; J. H. Williams & Co.; W. E. Aughinbaugh, foreign and export editor New York Commercial; Nafta Co.; Pfister & Vogel Leather Co.; McElwain, Morse & Rogers, all of New York City, favoring the continuation of the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1915. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the board of directors of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce relative to certain provisions in the present appropriation bill, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1916. Also, petition of McElwain, Morse & Rogers Co., of New York City, favoring maintenance of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1917. Also, petition of the Ship Construction & Trading Co. (Inc.), of New York, relative to certain legislation that will be introduced; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1918. Also, petition of the Nafta Co., of New York City, in support of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, etc.; also, the Samstag & Hilder Co., supporting the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1919. Also, petition of the Flatbush Chamber of Commerce, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to the Mexican situation, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1920. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of the George A. Morris Post, No. 306, the American Legion, of Paulding, Ohio, favoring House bill 4464; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1921. Also, petitions of the Warren L. McIntire Post, No. 262, the American Legion, of Hamler; the Herbert E. Anderson Post, No. 117, the American Legion, of Defiance; and the Ottawa Post, No. 63, of Ottawa, all in the State of Ohio, relative to all ex-service men and women entitled to bonus of \$50 bond, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 28, 1920.

(Legislative day of Friday, February 27, 1920.)

The Senate met in open executive session at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	Lodge	Sheppard
Borah	Harding	McKellar	Sherman
Brandeggee	Harris	McLean	Simmons
Capper	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Henderson	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Colt	Hitchcock	New	Smoot
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Sterling
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thomas
Dillingham	Kellogg	Owen	Trammell
Elkins	Kendrick	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kenyon	Phelan	Warren
France	Keyes	Phipps	Watson
Frelinghuysen	King	Poin Dexter	Williams
Gay	Kirby	Pomerene	
Gerry	Knox	Ransdell	
Gronna	Lenroot	Reed	

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.